The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 1900.

The Week.

Senator Hoar rendered an important service to the cause of human freedom by the few words of reply which he uttered at the conclusion of Senator Beveridge's speech on Tuesday week. Although he had announced his purpose to make a set speech on the subject of the debate, he saw the importance of pricking without delay the gas bag that the Indiana Senator had been so long inflating. This was done neatly and effectively by calling attention to the fact that, in the whole of Mr. Beveridge's address, so carefully prepared and printed and distributed before delivery, the words *right*, *justice*, *duty*, and *freedom* were wholly wanting. He went on to say that "practically every statement of fact in Senator Beveridge's speech was refuted by reports received from Admiral Dewey, Gen. Otis, and other official sources." This was a most sweeping statement, justifiable only by knowledge of the existence of reports from those officers which have not yet been made public. That such documents exist, or that Senator Hoar believes they exist, was made manifest by the resolution of inquiry which he at once introduced, asking for copies of all official communications to or from Aguinaldo or any other person commanding or representing the forces in hostility to the United States in the Philippines. In a subsequent letter, Senator Hoar makes more definite reference to this unpublished correspondence, saying that he has himself read some of these letters, and that they establish the fact that Aguinaldo is an honest, patriotic, and brave man, and is the chosen leader of the Philippine Islands. From other sources the report has gained currency that, at the time when the President sent his proclamation to the Filipinos which Gen. Otis altered on account of its incendiary character, peace had been practically secured. It has been rumored of late that the naval and military authorities in the Philippines, before the President's proclamation was received, were on the point of coming to an arrangement with Aguinaldo, by which hostilities would have been avoided altogether. If such are the facts, then the responsibility for all the waste of blood and treasure that has taken place since we bought or took the islands, rests on William McKinley.

Senator Beveridge has received a second lashing from the Republican side of the chamber, and from an unexpected quarter. Senator Wolcott took the same line of criticism as Mr. Hoar in a rather more picturesque manner. The immoral character of Beveridge's discourse on the wealth of the Philippines upon which we were to gorge ourselves, was held up to indignant scorn, and his highfalutin rhetoric was riddled with merciless sarcasm. Mr. Wolcott was not wholly free from highfalutin himself, but it was of a better kind that Beveridge's. He gave his attention also to the pretentious talk about the glory we were to acquire from an honest administration of the Philippine government. "With the municipal corruption that all admitted existed, it was ridiculous," he said, "to talk of appointing a lot of Indiana politicians in the Philippines and letting the reflected glory of the republic shine across the seas." It is true that Mr. Wolcott favors holding the Philippines as a matter of duty, or what he considers to be duty, but his exposure of the moral turpitude of Beveridge's plea for pelf was something for which he deserves hearty thanks.

Senator Beveridge unconsciously put a knife into the very midriff of the Administration when he declared that we must hold Manila in order thence to "command the trade of China." Then what has all the boasting been about, in connection with the "open door" in China? Are the diplomatic laurels to be plucked all green from Secretary Hay's brows? We have been assured over and over again that the Administration, by obtaining an international agreement for equality of trade privileges throughout the whole Chinese Empire, had already commanded the trade of China. Secretary Wilson was glorying in it publicly only the other day. England has been congratulating us on our great diplomatic achievement. No one said a word about Manila in the whole business. But now comes this tall talker of the Wabash and pours despite on the entire affair. If we do not hold Manila, that Chinese trade is for ever gone, he says, which the Administration had just informed us was for ever secured in quite another way. But the Indiana Senator seems to have a certain natural awkwardness in support of his friends.

The influence of the political "pull" in the relations of the national Government with the banking business of the country is clearly illustrated in the revelations regarding the selection, a few months ago, of the Seventh National Bank of this city as the depository of the post-office funds, in place of the Chase National Bank, which had long acted in that capacity. Those interested in banking observed that some changes were made in the Seventh National Bank last year, the most significant of which was the accession as a director of Perry S. Heath, First Assistant Postmaster-General, and the selection of his brother, Fletcher S. Heath, as its Vice-President. As these Indianians had never become prominent in the banking business, those who knew Perry S. Heath as a "hustler" at once concluded that he was capitalizing his political influence, rather than his knowledge or experience as a financier. This has now been proved. The statutes enable the Post-office Department, instead of the Treasury, to select the bank in which its funds shall be kept, and the First Assistant Postmaster-General soon took this privilege from the Chase National, and gave it to the bank of which Perry S. Heath was a director and his brother the Vice-President. The President of the Heath bank, William H. Kimball, was perfectly frank in explaining the matter to a *Herald* reporter on Friday. He is quoted as saying:

> "It is a case of business competition, and political influence counts. The man who can pull the most wires successfully often wins."

The bearing of all this upon the question of our expansion policy is plain and important. The spread-eagle orator from Indiana said in the Senate, the other day, that "the men we send to administer civilized government in the Philippines must be themselves the highest examples of our civilization"; that no one need "fear that our party workers will seek to fill these places without regard to fitness"; but that "I know well this most maligned and most valuable class of American citizens, the precinct committeemen and party workers in the country districts of the republic; and if we truthfully, bravely state the situation at the outset, these very politicians will insist most strenuously of all on the highest possible qualifications in the administration of our possessions." Senator Beveridge, of course, speaks of his own State. Perry S. Heath, is the most prominent Republican party worker in Indiana. He has already shown that he considers it entirely proper for the First Assistant Postmaster-General to act as chairman of a national partisan committee, to "take a week off" in order to manage the Republican side of the fight for the control of Kentucky, and to get himself and his brother into the directorate of a New York bank, with a view to using his place in the department to secure favors for that bank. Was ever anything more ridiculous than the claim that the Perry S. Heaths, who insist upon having the offices at home and running them on the basis of the political "pull," will insist upon model adminis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tration in managing the government of the Philippines?

How to get Cuba annexed to the United States with the least amount of trouble from the Cubans, and with the smallest apparent violation of the promises made by our Government, is the evident aim of the committee on colonial relations of the Senate, if we may credit a Washington telegram in the *Sun*. The committee, it says, will visit Cuba to learn from actual observation how much time will be required to bring the island under the influence of American ideas and American methods. The journey will be made in February. The telegram continues:

> "It is evidently the prevailing sentiment among the members of this committee that the annexation of Cuba will ultimately result, and perhaps at no distant day. In the meantime, the Cubans will enjoy that independence promised them in the resolutions of Congress which brought on the war with Spain. According to one member of the committee, annexation will be brought about by a perfectly natural process of transition."

It is to be hoped that the committee will include in their inquiries the question, how much time will be required to bring American institutions under the influence of Cuban ideas and Cuban methods. Under our form of government political action and reaction are equal. The "pull" which Cuba will have on the United States will be, like the pull of the planets on each other, in proportion to her mass. On this subject read the speech delivered by ex-Gov. Boutwell at the anti-imperialist meeting in Washington on Thursday evening.

The report comes from Washington that Quay's case and Clark's case for seats in the Senate are somehow joined together. If they are not joined, they ought to be. Both represent the very worst side of American politics. Quay has been known and read of all men for twenty years. His character has been established "from way back." Clark is a new comer, and it appears from the testimony taken in his case that a seat in the Senate from Montana goes to the highest bidder for cash, and is obtainable in no other way. The revelations made in this case are positively sickening. They are as bad as the stories we read of Roman elections in the last days of the republic. It is related, as the acme of corruption at that time, that a deposit was once made of 800 talents to secure the consulship. We should judge that this had been done in Montana to seat Clark, and that 800 more had been deposited to unseat him.

Mr. Kasson encounters difficulties in explaining the advantages of the reciprocity treaty with France to the Senate committee on foreign relations. He seems to have made a very painful impression by remarking that in the tariff act of 1897 many of the rates were intentionally made higher than necessary, in order to render it easier to negotiate reciprocity treaties. A number of prominent Congressmen are reported to have declared such a statement wholly unwarranted. They are shocked at the idea that Congress should have been actuated by such mercenary considerations. Mr. Kasson may have been rather blunt in his language, but really the tariff act speaks for itself. It provides that, "with a view to secure reciprocal trade," treaties may be made with foreign countries, which, in consideration of the advantages to the United States of tariff concessions by those countries, shall reduce the duties that we impose on the importation of some of their products. These treaties are to be made "with a view to the arrangement of commercial agreements in which reciprocal and equivalent concession may be secured in favor of the products and manufactures of the United States." It is preposterous to contend that the rates in our tariff were not determined with reference to this contingency. The people who settle our tariff duties are not so guileless as to have adopted rates without thinking of the possibility of reciprocity treaties. Of course they will oppose any reductions by treaty or legislation, but they need not pretend that the tariff was not framed with the prospect of "reciprocal and equivalent concessions" distinctly in view. The only tenable ground is to assert that the concessions to be obtained from France are not "equivalent" to those to be made by the United States.

The mind of the ordinary protectionist must be painfully confused by the exigencies of imperialism. The President's message bore a startling resemblance to a Cobden Club essay, and the Republican papers are filled with insidious representations of the benefits of free trade, Beyond question the mainstay of protection in this country has been the belief that the high standard of living attained by American labor was due to the tariff. Protective duties excluded the products of cheap labor and gave the American market to American labor. But here is the New York *Tribune* publishing views completely subversive of the protectionist faith. It prints an interview with a Gen. Stone, who goes so far as to ridicule the cheap-labor argument, to sneer at the tariff, and to insinuate that free trade with our new conquests is something required by philanthropy and the Christian religion. This renegade protectionist, who professes to have "stood by protection to American labor through thick and thin," says that the argument that "one-half the people in Puerto Rico live on 5 cents a day or less" is convincing only to stupid people. However correct this statement may appear from our point of view, it is evident that a sincere protectionist ought to regard it as highly esoteric doctrine. It is profaning the mysteries to give it publicity. Gen. Stone says that the American workman might like to have an orange, or a banana, or a pineapple, or a good cigar to smoke without paying the price of a Havana. "He might even like to have fresh winter vegetables without paying the hothouse price, but he finds that tobacco and vegetables are not worth raising in Puerto Rico, and delicious fruits not even worth picking because of the high tariff here, while American flour, meat, and manufactures are shut out from the island by the tariff which we impose there." It is certainly doubtful if a paper which prints such underhand attacks on the tariff as this ought to be allowed in a protectionist household.

In order to avert a suspension of building operations in Chicago, the labor unions have abandoned many of their extravagant demands. Affairs had come to such a pass that builders no longer dared to take contracts, not knowing in what losses future orders of the walking-delegates might involve them. Not only were they required to employ union labor and to use union material, but that material had to be of home production, regardless of the fact that better goods could be purchased from outside the city at less cost. On top of that, the unions claimed the right to determine the maximum amount of labor which their members should do in a day, at a price fixed by themselves. It was an attempt to arbitrarily provide work for everybody at good wages, and it nearly resulted in throwing all the building trades workers out of employment. By the agreement now made between the unions and the contractors, the latter are free to get their material anywhere, always provided that it is of union production, while the matter of unreasonable restrictions upon the amount of work done, and questions of apprentices, of sympathetic strikes, and of the usurpation of walking-delegates, are to be referred to arbitration. The unions retain, among other things, the "right" to fix the wage scale, but they have surrendered much. Even a Labor Trust has limitations, albeit it does not fear the Attorney-General.

Louisiana Republicans think that they see in Democratic disaffection over the nomination of Heard for Governor, at the dictation of Gov. Foster, an opportunity for something more than a forlorn-hope campaign. The situation is much the same as in 1896, when a coalition of the Republican factions with the Populists nearly overthrew the Democrats, and an attempt is making to renew that coalition. An agreement for united primaries and conventions has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been entered into between the Regulars and the Sugar Republicans, the line of division between which factions appears to have been nearly wiped out by the Democratic disfranchisement of the illiterate negroes. With no longer any fear of negro domination in the State, the Sugar Republicans, many of whose leaders are seceders from the Democratic party on protection grounds, and who have shown hitherto all the Southern Democrat's antipathy to the negro in politics, now argue in favor of welcoming to the party fold the intelligent negroes left on the registry lists. They have surrendered their title to the appellation of "Lily-White Republicans," the primary call just issued by their committee inviting all Republicans, "without distinction as to race or color." There are many men of character and standing in this organization, and out of it may perhaps come what some intelligent Democrats foresaw in negro disfranchisement—the creation of a strong opposition party which disaffected Democrats may join without losing caste.

The reports of the Mazet committee have been so thoroughly discounted in advance that only a languid interest is felt in the full text. The majority, of course, try to unload the full responsibility for the present misgovernment of New York city upon Tammany. The character of the administration is fairly summarized when it is styled "the most perfect instance of centralized party government yet known; government no longer responsible to the people, but to a Dictator; the central power, not the man who sits in the Mayor's chair, but the man who stands behind it; the powers of government prostituted to protect criminals, to demoralize the police, to debauch the public conscience, and to turn governmental functions into channels for private gain." But it is hardly a fair implication to give the impression that "a majority of the voters of Greater New York are satisfied with the present system, theory, and practice of government." The present administration represents a minority of the voters. More than 300,000 ballots were cast for Mayor in 1897, of which Van Wyck received only 143,666, or more than 6,000 short of half. The followers of Seth Low, Benjamin F. Tracy, and Henry George cast a total of 155,916 votes, and everybody familiar with the facts knows that the hearty support of Low by the Republican machine would have elected him.

The investigation into the affairs of the State Trust Company has revealed the interesting fact that "Lou" Payn, not a great while ago, borrowed from that institution $435,000. This loan was made to a man against whom judgments had been filed, over and over again, from his early manhood in 1859 down to within less than three years of his appointment as Superintendent of Insurance in this State in 1897. Some of these judgments had not been satisfied when he assumed office. Payn, of course, insists that the securities which he furnished as a basis for this loan were good, but the better they were, the greater the surprise that a man with such a financial record before becoming head of the Insurance Department early in 1897 should enjoy this high rank among capitalists before the end of 1899. Quite aside from any question of Payn's character and standing before his appointment by Gov. Black, what impression must be made upon the public mind by the discovery that an official occupying such a fiduciary position as that of Insurance Superintendent is engaged in great speculative schemes?

Mr. Dorman B. Eaton could hardly have made a better disposition of the sums left by him to Harvard and Columbia Universities, than by his requirement that they be used in founding professorships in the science of government and municipal administration. In this department at Harvard there has for years been a particular weakness, which has not failed to attract attention, and has led students of civics to seek other colleges for what they could not find in the Cambridge curriculum. There could be no more fitting time than the present to endow a professorship to "vindicate and strengthen" the "great principles upon which our national Constitution is based," and to point out "the obligations of the moral law and of patriotic endeavor in party politics and all official life." Nor could any better place be found than a college in the city of New York in which to found a chair to "gather municipal wisdom from the most enlightened cities," and to make good city government "the ambition and endeavor of the worthiest citizens." It is truly gratifying that the influence of a man who, from the purest of motives, devoted his life to the betterment of the governments under which he lived, should continue to be felt in institutions to which the country must look for some of its most ardent reformers and patriotic citizens.

A very desirable reform has at last been adopted by the Government in the matter of the charges of the Assay Office for gold bars. Hereafter these bars will be furnished by the Assay Office at a charge of four cents per $100, instead of ten cents. The charge was raised to ten cents some years ago on the theory that gold might thus be kept in the country. The reasoning of the Treasury officers was that, by making it expensive to obtain gold bars, the sordid bankers who wanted to export gold when it was needed here would be balked. They would find their miserable profit cut off by the charge for gold bars, while they would be kept from exporting coin by the loss from abrasion which would appear when the coin was melted in foreign mints. This petty expedient for maintaining the solvency of the United States Treasury was on a par with the device anciently resorted to in times of panic in England, of paying depositors in sixpences. There is nothing better in Adam Smith's writings than the chapter in which he examines the effect of the export duties on specie formerly imposed in Spain, and demonstrates the futility and the positive mischief of all such measures. The charge of ten cents per $100 for gold bars no doubt discouraged their export; but coin was exported instead, and the Government was, therefore, put to the expense and waste of coinage, to say nothing of the charges for transporting bullion and coin between New York and Philadelphia. It raised its charge for a service which cost it very little, and was compelled by its own act to render services which cost it a good deal. No one pretends that the movement of gold was checked by this paltry measure, and it is hardly necessary to say that it did not increase confidence in the solvency of the Treasury. When a man is found to be taking steps to stave off his obligations, his credit is not improved. We may reasonably expect that the beginning of the next century will find the Government permanently relieved from the temptation to resort to such contemptible means for maintaining its solvency.

The English Government appears to have receded from its first contention that food is contraband of war. That we take to be the meaning of its release of the cargoes of American flour, and its announcement that it will not regard provisions as contraband "unless intended for the enemy." By the enemy is meant armed opponents in the field. Food for the enemy's country is another thing. It is legitimate to try to reduce men in arms by cutting off their supplies, but not to starve non-combatants. If such is the scope of the decision arrived at, we regard it as a great gain for international law, and a wise thing for England. The status of food in time of war has been unsettled, and the present deliberate action of Great Britain in taking it definitively off the contraband list will go far toward settling universal practice. England's own interest is transparently against treating provisions as contraband. Lord Rosebery wrote to the London *Times* on December 28, referring to the "disquieting intimations" that the Government was treating food-stuffs as contraband, and calling for "an authoritative statement" on the matter of such "supreme importance." He has now got it, and it is to the effect that England does not propose to take a position which might result in her being starved in case of war with a country owning a first-class navy.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EX ORIENTE LUX.

A flood of light on the Philippine intrigue is thrown by Admiral Dewey's report to the Navy Department, dated Hong Kong, March 31, 1898. It was published for the first time on Thursday, having been sent to the Senate by special request. Dewey, like the careful officer he was, had thoroughly investigated the state of the Spanish defences at Manila, and expressed his confidence that he could reduce them and put the city at his mercy in a single day. He did exactly that one month later. It was, of course, strictly in the line of his duty to inform his Government respecting the military situation, and the Navy Department would have been inexcusable if it had not, at the time it telegraphed Dewey, been making up its mind what to do if war broke out. But the significant, the critical part of Dewey's report is this: "There is every reason to believe that, with Manila taken or even blockaded, the *rest of the islands would fall* either to the insurgents or ourselves."

Now, it is not too much to say that this sweeps completely away the defence of our Philippine adventure which has been made by the President and his most ardent supporters. What is that defence? Why, that when the war began, this Government never dreamed of annexing the Philippines. Dewey was sent only to destroy the Spanish fleet. That was a perfectly legitimate operation, as both a blow to the military power of our enemy and a means of protecting our Pacific Coast. But, to the surprise and almost to the consternation of the President, he found that it would not do to recall Dewey's squadron; that he must send troops; that he must take Manila and occupy Luzon, and that then, led on strangely by Destiny and Providence, he must, with many misgivings, much against his will, and in obedience only to a lofty sense of national duty, instruct our Paris Commissioners to demand cession of the whole archipelago. This is no caricature of Mr. McKinley's account of his Philippine stewardship. Read what he said in Boston on February 16, 1899: "The Philippines were intrusted to our hands by the providence of God. It is a trust we have not sought."

In the light of Dewey's report this now sounds uncommonly like a devout explanation by Ah Sin that the twenty-four packs in his sleeves found their way there providentially. Here was the Commodore of the squadron writing three weeks before war was declared. In answer to inquiries from his Government, he distinctly foreshadowed the seizure of the whole group. "The rest of the islands would fall either to the insurgents or ourselves." This was in the hands of the Administration at the very time when it was asserting that the occupation of the islands was a pure afterthought, a dire military necessity unforeseen, an unexpected command of God. What can we say now of such talk except that it was sheer hypocrisy? There have been many hints and indications before that the annexation of the Philippines was a part of the Administration programme from the very first. People in the confidence of Admiral Dewey and Assistant Secretary Roosevelt, as he then was, have smiled knowingly over the theory that nobody ever dreamed of our taking the Philippines. But now we have the first official document proving that the thing was contemplated from the beginning. Is it any wonder that when Senator Sewell went to the President and begged him to order Dewey to sail away after the battle of Manila Bay, lest complications arise and we be compelled to take over the islands, Mr. McKinley refused to comply? Dewey was there precisely in order to make the islands "fall to ourselves," and the President knew it. He had a sure inkling of the vast designs of Providence in that matter, because he had been acting in the spirit of the old Puritan who said, when some one piously sighed, "Well, God mend all!" "Nay, we must help him to mend it!"

Only less important than Dewey's report is the official "Report of Tour through Island of Luzon" made in November, 1898, by two naval officers of Dewey's squadron, and only now given to the public. Senator Hoar succeeded in extracting this valuable document from the Navy Department, and getting it printed in the *Congressional Record*. It is endorsed by Admiral Dewey as "the most complete and reliable information obtainable," and it is no exaggeration to say that it completely snuffs out the speech of Senator Beveridge. These naval officers, Messrs. Wilcox and Sargent, travelled for six weeks in the interior of Luzon, and discovered such evidences of general intelligence and education, and good order and respect for the law, and patriotic aspiration, that the record is one, we should think, to bring a blush even to the cheek of the superior Lodge, who was again arguing last week that the Filipinos are but a set of savages, who ought to be only too happy to have us come and kill them in a civilized way.

What is most encouraging about the whole situation is that light is beginning to dawn. Whenever the cover is taken off the Philippine iniquity, a fresh set of its defenders are struck dumb. Every new document which the Administration can be forced to publish is practically a new exposure of blundering or worse. More official reports are to come. Gen. Otis's report, which so clearly convicts the President of being the one man responsible for the war with the Filipinos, speaks of naval reports or representations made from Manila in December, 1898. What were they? Was one of them a report from Dewey which, it has been alleged, the President quite disregarded and so floundered into his war? We shall soon know, for the Senate has asked for all the documents in the case, and if the Government does not give them up, its silence will be, like suicide, a confession. In any case, the policy of secrecy and suppression is evidently drawing to its end. It is a most righteous "itch to know things" which the country at present has regarding these Philippine mysteries; and the sooner we get to the bottom of the affair, the sooner we shall know whether it was Destiny, alias Providence, or an ambitious coterie of plotters at Washington, that got this white elephant of the Orient on our hands.

THE BANKERS AND THE TREASURY.

The letters from two prominent bankers to the Secretary of the Treasury, which were made public by him last week, are not pleasant reading. Probably no one who knows the authors of these letters would attribute to them any corrupt purpose. In one case the letter amounted merely to a suggestion that a delay in paying over to the Government a fund arising from the Central Pacific Railroad settlement would help the financial situation. It was accompanied with a statement that the call loans of the City Bank were at the time $56,000,000, and that the rates on the more speculative collaterals in Wall Street were high enough to force liquidation. The inference is unavoidable that if the City Bank could retain the deposits of the Government for a week, it would make a large profit from their use. It could lend larger amounts, at very exceptional rates. Moreover, if the President of the bank were assured of this money for a week, while the public knew nothing of it, very profitable operations in stocks were possible. Very likely a public service would be rendered by such action as was suggested. Panic might be checked, failures prevented, the normal and legitimate demands of borrowers be met. Nevertheless, these good results were to be produced by means that are scarcely defensible on any sound theory of government. The notion that the Secretary of the Treasury is a *deus ex machinâ*, whose duty it is to relieve hard-pressed debtors and to maintain prices for those who have to unload, ought to be repudiated. Many people remember the unpleasant events under Gen. Grant's Administration, and we might fairly say that scandals have attended the relations of the Treasury with the banks during a large part of the existence of our government.

The other letter is simply an illustration of the demoralization resulting from the doctrine of political spoils. It was written in behalf of a bank which was already a Government depository, and which desired to remain such. There was no impropriety in making such a statement, nor in calling attention to the financial strength of the bank. But the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

letter closed with the intimation that the directors of the bank had rendered great services to the Republican party, and that on that account the bank had claims on the United States Treasury. The natural meaning of these words is that the directors had contributed a great deal of money to the Republican campaign fund, and that they expected to be repaid in some fashion and in some degree by favors of the Treasury. Very likely the author of the letter was unconscious of any impropriety in making such a suggestion. It was not intended as a request for any illegal favors. It was meant to remind the Secretary of the Treasury that in such matters of discretion as the choice of depositories of public funds, some regard should be had to the party services of bank directors.

There is nothing more in this than is involved in the claim which all our politicians believe in, and which most of them openly maintain, that the general Government is to be carried on for the immediate advantage of the managers of the dominant political party. The post-offices are to be filled with Republicans when they come into power. So are the custom-houses, the internal-revenue offices, the consulships, the departments in general. Some one must have the office, it is argued, and it is absurd to give it to a man who has done nothing for the success of the party, when those who have borne the burden and the heat of the day really need to be supported. In precisely the same way it can be argued that, as the Secretary of the Treasury is obliged to designate certain banks as depositories, it is reasonable that he should choose banks with good Republican directors. If there is any profit in these deposits, it ought to go to Republican bankers under a Republican Administration; and it ought especially to go to such bankers as paid the most money to put the Republican Administration in power. There is no question of loss to the Government; its deposits are well secured. It is simply a question of favoring Republican bankers who contribute to the party revenues, rather than Democratic bankers, or those who make no contributions. Let no one cast a stone against the bankers who wrote these letters unless he is ready to condemn the spoils system, root and branch.

We may profitably recall an episode in the political campaign of 1888. A letter from a Republican Senator was brought to light then, with very important political results. "If I had my way about it," said the author of this letter, "I would put the manufacturers of Pennsylvania under the fire, and fry all the fat out of them." He also said: "I was solicited to contribute to a protective-tariff league, and I replied that . . . . I did not propose myself to contribute money to advance the interests of men who were getting practically the sole benefit, or at least the most directly important benefits, of the tariff laws." This letter opened the eyes of many people to the true nature of protective legislation. Those who are engaged in lines of business the profits of which are affected by foreign competition, pay liberally to elect Congressmen who will pass laws to protect them against competitors. When they have elected their Congressmen, they think that they own the Government. They have paid to constitute it in a particular way, for their particular pecuniary benefit. All our prominent manufacturers understand this very well, and never think of disputing it in private conversation. Bring the subject up, and they are very apt to mention some aggravated case of tariff favoritism. Bankers have until recently been more exempt from this political demoralization, but the exigencies of 1896, when their business became a political issue, were too much for many of them. Yet, in spite of the callousness of so many of our business men, there is a great volume of popular wrath at, and loathing for, the whole system of plutocracy, and had the Democrats a leader of real honesty and ability, he would be a formidable candidate for the Presidency.

REFORM BY SOCIAL STIGMA.

President Hadley's address at Denver has been variously reported, and it would be obviously unfair to pin him down to any form of words put into his mouth by a newspaper. There appears to be no doubt, however, that he did in a general way advocate social ostracism as a weapon of moral and political reform. In particular he urged social punishments for men whose wealth has been acquired by dishonorable, or at least anti-social, means. "When," said President Hadley, "it is understood that a man who does certain things cannot associate with his fellow-men, it will penetrate deeply into the social organism." Social disqualification, he added, and condemnation by public opinion, together make up the strongest force in the business and political world.

To this we heartily agree. Granted that there were in any given community an austere and high-minded and well-organized and stable social opinion, which could be depended upon to put a stigma upon the man who had heaped up riches by illicit means—especially upon a man who makes politics a matter of buying and selling—no more powerful instrument for righteousness could well be imagined. Wealth is sought for social ends. No man would live laborious days to acquire money, did he not look upon it as the thing which would throw open to him, or at least to his children, the doors of social enjoyment. To sit down as a social pariah, though cushioned by millions of bank-notes, is a wretched existence. Many an adventurer in times past has mournfully asked himself, when lying outside the social breastworks, "Was it for this that I turned such sharp corners, wrecked banks, and burst bubbles of speculation—only to find myself flung out here?" A man who has reached wealth by "rubs and doublings and wrenches" finds himself more miserable than Midas if he cannot make it minister to his social cravings. He can travel, he can buy pictures as he would cotton, books as he would cord-wood, but what can he get out of all this but vanity and vexation of spirit? What he wants is the regard and recognition of the best people; and we thoroughly endorse President Hadley's contention that, if these could be withheld from the shady capitalist, or the man who has fought his way to the top over the ruin of his own character and the wreck of other men's fortunes, it would be an unequalled power making for righteousness.

But, alas, where does this social Rhadamanthus exist? Where can we find this severe, this compact, this sensitive and scrupulous "society," ready to ostracise money that smells of blood or is tarnished by social crimes? We wish we could think that there is such a thing any more in this country—in any appreciable force, we mean. Of course, there is a remnant of it in our large cities—a few families in Philadelphia whose glances still freeze the upstart speculator; an inner circle in New York to secure entrance into which a man has to send in some other visiting-card than a certificate of deposit for $10,000,000; an intellectual élite in Boston that pours scorn upon the manipulators of gas stocks and the deities of the caucus. But is it not the truth that our society as a whole has lost the power of scourging wealth unscrupulously gained, because it has capitulated to wealth as such? As luxury has swept in upon our social life, we have ceased to discriminate too sharply. If lavish living is the sign of social standing, then the man able to squander his thousands on social joys provides his own satisfactory *cachet*. President Hadley would find it very difficult to get "society" to ostracise the successful gamblers in finance and politics when, in too many cases, its recognized "leaders" are the very ones who would first have to go. The most we could get in the way of denunciation would be an application of Clough's "Latest Decalogue":

> "Thou shalt not steal; an empty feat
> When 'tis so lucrative to cheat."

To bring this matter disagreeably home to the bosoms and business of New Yorkers, what social results may we expect to follow from the recent revelations in the financial and political world? Will anybody "ostracise" the bankers who went on their knees to Platt to get a Government deposit? Will the men who let Payn and Sheehan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have enormous loans, with a well-understood political attachment, find their fellows looking askance at them?

Even our political corruptionists we are at last recognizing socially. The moral harm that Gov. Roosevelt and President Low have done by sitting down amicably to breakfast with Platt is incalculable. He was almost as much of a social outcast as Hill, before these social eminences recognized him as an equal. But the power of discrimination in these matters seems almost gone; and our "society" will soon deserve George William Curtis's burlesque account of the rich noodle in Newport, looking about him at the ball and saying complacently and innocently, "Well, I see all the *parvenus* are here!" The churches have a terrible responsibility in this matter. Who does not remember the Presbyterian coquetting with Jay Gould? What Protestant church in this city would refuse a present of $50,000 from Platt to support a vested choir? What Catholic church would turn on Croker, bearing gifts, with an indignant, "Thy money perish with thee"? The pious Quay has founded a church in Pennsylvania, and, we do not doubt, would endow a theological seminary if necessary. At a certain stage of his career every wealthy corruptionist is said to fairly pine for a theological seminary to take his money. And what do the ecclesiastical—yes, and the educational—authorities do in such cases except to imitate the old Scotch minister who told the dying skinflint that he could not guarantee that a gift to the church would save his soul, but that "the experiment was well worth trying"?

But, when all this is said, we repeat that President Hadley is on the right track. He speaks for the ideal of society. What society should be is the great moral and reformatory power he alludes to. It should be separate and touch not the unclean thing. It should smite the evil-doer, though he be rich, with open scorn and pass a decree of perpetual banishment against him. We greatly need a quickening of our social sensitiveness, and the best way to induce it is to show what a power for good it might be made. Matthew Arnold said there could be no human perfection without society; and it is our business to make society the deadly foe of human imperfection, so that illegitimate wealth shall have the brand of social disqualification burned into it, and political tricksters, together with those who strike hands with them and hire them as bravos or panders, shall be made to lie in social outer darkness.

"THE MILLS OF GOD."

About 1880 Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was emerging from Birmingham municipal politics, making his appearance in the larger imperial arena, caucus in hand, and calling on the rich to pay ransom to the poor. I was naturally curious about his personality, and I wrote to a friend in England to ask what kind of man he was. My friend consulted a high authority, who told him, among other things, that "Chamberlain was the first politician of the American type that they had had in England, and would give a great deal of trouble."

I have been deeply impressed ever since with the acuteness of this observation. What this gentleman meant by the "American type" was undoubtedly the kind of man who considers public questions with his ear to the ground, makes up his mind about them with strict reference to the next election, and changes that mind as he would change clothes, according to the season. It was evident almost from the first year of Chamberlain's political career that he was "on the make," as we say in America—not, of course, for money, since he did not need that, but in respect to his personal political fortune. He at once took up the Irish business, which then seemed the most promising one. Home rule had not yet made its appearance, but the Irish under Parnell were threatening trouble. So they, as well as the poor, became in Chamberlain's eyes the most wronged of mankind. It was then that he made that famous "Poland speech," which bothered him so much afterwards, in which he compared the lot of the unhappy Irish to that of the Poles, ground down by Russian tyranny. He cast in his lot thoroughly with the Irish, as well as with the poor. It was current gossip in Liberal circles at that time that he wanted to be Irish Secretary, and that it was the bestowal of the place on Lord Frederick Cavendish which implanted in Mr. Chamberlain that dislike of Mr. Gladstone which burned brightly in him long before Home Rule, and satisfied him that this bad old man was not a man for him to tie to. Mr. Chamberlain, however, soon showed himself to be too adroit a politician and too powerful a debater to be ignored, and Gladstone had to give him "something equally as good." This was the presidency of the Board of Trade. I remember reading a speech of his at that period respecting the failure of a shipping bill introduced by him, which failure he ascribed to the then wicked Lord Salisbury. I read one later, after he had joined the Conservatives, in which he ascribed it to the doubly wicked Mr. Gladstone. I dare say there exists some means of reconciling the two statements, but it is not within my reach.

Every one remembers how Home Rule carried Mr. Chamberlain over to the Conservatives. I was in the House of Commons the night he made his final speech about this atrocious attempt to tear to pieces his beloved empire. His peroration, showing how much it all cost him internally, had a falsetto note, which, I observed, excited the smiles of my neighbors in the Speaker's Gallery. But he was now at the goal of his striving. He was in the best society of England, and had no longer any dealings with the wicked old Gladstone or the low Irish, and when the Conservatives should come in, he was sure of something. He got the Colonial Secretaryship.

I am recalling these events, not so much for the purpose of discrediting Mr. Chamberlain as for that of illustrating the moral government of the world. President Lincoln was not wrong in his second message in pointing out how nations and men are sure to atone some day for great errors or great crimes. Since Peel's day the English Tories have never been content with a statesman of their own order, taken from their own ranks. No one familiar with the character and prejudices and history of English gentlemen would have believed for a moment beforehand that a Jewish literary adventurer, however clever of speech, living by his wits, would have the slightest chance of a political career among them. But Disraeli had a most successful one, and rose so high in English social and political life that he had a narrow escape from being put in "orders" and made Archbishop of Canterbury. His antics amused them, and his cleverness saved them trouble. Nevertheless, it seemed unlikely that he would soon have a successor. But he was hardly dead when his successor turned up. For a literary adventurer was substituted a dealer in screws, a powerful debater, with no convictions to speak of, and a vaulting ambition. Home Rule, which turned so many English heads, and made the most distinguished public man they have had since Pitt a favorite object of the billingsgate of the upper classes, gave them Chamberlain as their man-of-all-work; and Lord Salisbury, able as he is, succumbed to him, just as he succumbed to Disraeli. He does not seem to have checked him once in his crazy colonial policy.

Who will say now that Providence has not in this way, dark and mysterious though it be, avenged the famous "wrongs of Ireland"? Could there be a more grateful topic of conversation, even among the chiefs and ladies bright in "the Halls of Tara," than the manner in which the great anti-Home-Rule Colonial Secretary had been "euchered" by a Dutch farmer into a bloody war for which he was not prepared, and in which the one "neglected estate" that he had undertaken to "cultivate" proved to be a nest of ten-pound hornets? Verily, the mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceeding small. E. L. G.

THE WINTER EXHIBITIONS.

LONDON, January 1, 1900.

As I sit down to write, I hear drums in the street below—probably the Volunteers on their way to the Guildhall to be sworn in. I can see nothing, for London is wrapped—choked—in a thick, wet, gray fog. There could not be a more melancholy opening to the new year. It scarcely seems a moment when Englishmen are likely to spare much thought for pictures, or time for galleries. But it just so happens that the winter exhibitions at the Academy and the New Gallery have seldom been more interesting; the one supplementing the other, and both together giving as complete and representative a collection of the Flemish masters as could well be got together in one place, unless the national galleries of the world combined to arrange it. And after all, however absorbing other matters may seem at this crisis, Van Eyck and Memling, Rubens and Van Dyck, will live long after Krüger and Chamberlain, Joubert and Buller, are but names!

The idea, of course, originated in the Van Dyck celebrations at Antwerp last summer. The Academy had already been so successful in repeating the Rembrandt show of Amsterdam that the new opportunity for a good winter exhibition was not

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be overlooked; especially as it would be even easier to represent Van Dyck in London than Rembrandt. All the finest pictures at Antwerp, with the exception of the famous "Lord Wharton" that belongs to the Hermitage, came from England, where there were many more, as every one knew, that had not been trusted out of the country. This being decided upon, the directors of the New Gallery were wise enough to make their show an introduction to the Academy, by completing in it the representations of the Flemish school up to the time of Van Dyck, and also a sequel by including a few examples of the English portrait-painters who were Van Dyck's direct descendants.

The work has been done as well as it could be, I fancy, under the conditions. In a loan collection you must take not always what you want, but what you can get. The historical sequence is somewhat interrupted by the great gulf between the Primitives and Rubens, and again between Van Dyck and Reynolds and Gainsborough. But still, it suggests, if it does not follow in every stage, the development of Flemish art that led from the early immature performances of the old Guildsmen to the masterpieces of the greatest of the Flemings, and then, through their influence, to the portraits of the most distinguished group of painters England can boast. If you turn immediately from the austere, firm, uncompromising realism of the Van Eycks to the elegant, delightfully artificial conventions of Reynolds and Gainsborough, it may seem impossible to believe in any relation between them. But the two exhibitions supply many of the connecting links.

At the New Gallery the room devoted to the Primitives is most satisfactory—that is, from the historical standpoint. I do not think any pictures suffer as grievously as theirs from being seen, a great number together, in a gallery. These early painters almost always worked for a definite decorative purpose. Their Virgins and Christs, their saints and angels, were intended to serve as altar-pieces, to adorn reliquaries, to become a part of church or convent walls. They were never meant to be looked at apart from their surroundings. Did we not realize but yesterday the difference between the decorations of Puvis de Chavannes, when they hung in the Champ-de-Mars Salon, and when, afterwards, they were in their place in the building for which they were designed? The early masters lose still more, for in the gallery we are doubly conscious of their imperfections and limitations, it is difficult to judge of the decorative merit of their work, and there is no longer the sentiment of place that can make us forgive and even rejoice in their failures. Take Memling in Bruges, as the most striking example: I, for one, should not like to say how much my pleasure in him there comes from the innumerable associations of the quiet old Hospital, from the impressions of Fromentin passing through the same rooms, from (perhaps) the exaggerated melancholy of Rodenbach in his Bruges-la-Morte. But Memling in London, at the New Gallery, away from Bruges and its charm and glamour, becomes but the painter to be catalogued, classified, but a good subject for the ingenuity of the scientific critic. The pictures attributed to him yesterday are to-day labelled with some one else's name; his name to-morrow may be on a dozen pictures never hitherto claimed for him. He is a specimen to be studied, as the chemist studies his gases or the doctor his microbes.

I do not deny that a certain amount of exact classification is an excellent thing, but when it turns art into archæology, when the art critic adopts the methods of the literary critic whose only interest in Shakspere is to prove that he was Bacon, then I do not see that any good is accomplished. This is particularly true of many of the Primitives, who, to be honest, are not worth all the talk there is about them. Since the pre-Raphaelites, there has been a sort of superstition that the Primitives were, until the middle of this century, the only painters who went to nature for inspiration, when the truth is, never were painters so hampered by formulas imposed upon them. They could, I admit, in matters of detail, work with the realism of the Van Eycks. When, occasionally, they escaped from the religious subjects usually demanded from them, they did go to nature, apparently with relief, and, as far as it was possible within their limitations, with quite amazing results. Who can forget that wonderful portrait of Giovanni Arnolfini and his wife by Van Eyck in the National Gallery? And here, in the New Gallery, continually, through an open window or beyond the Christ Crucified or the Virgin and Child Enthroned, you look to a charming little landscape, or to the towers and battlements of a mediæval town set upon a hill, full of careful observation and distinctly individual in treatment. But in carrying out a religious motive certain things were expected of them by the patrons for whom they worked, and the consequence is a monotony in design and method that really is the second reason why it is a mistake to see so much of their work together. I have always felt this in the rooms full of Primitives in the great national collections—as must everybody else whose emotions have not been duly manufactured beforehand; and I feel it again in the New Gallery. There are some fine examples of the Van Eycks, Memling, Mabuse, Gheereart David, Van Orley, Quentin Matsys that I long to see back again over the altar or in the chapels or shrines where they originally belonged. However, as I have said, they have their historical value and importance in the exhibition, in any review of Flemish art; and archaic though they are, with their rich color, their careful draughtsmanship, their technical accomplishment, they seem worthy to prepare the way for Rubens.

Of all the masters, Rubens is probably the one who has the most serious disappointments in store even for his admirers. His name has become a synonym for splendor, for a flamboyant stateliness, for a voluptuous beauty, for a vigor, a vitality, simply amazing. The stories, the evidence too, of his facility take your breath away. You know the impression he made upon his contemporary, Velasquez, the influence he had upon his pupil, Van Dyck. But then, Rubens ran a shop, a picture manufactory. His assistants and students produced half, probably more than half, the work turned out in his name. The design may have been his, the painting was theirs. Compare one of his beautiful little sketches with the finished canvas, and the animation, the life, the soul has gone; only the empty swagger remains. What could be more wearisome than the acres of Rubens in the Louvre, in Munich, even in Antwerp—I mean in the Museum, not in the Cathedral, where, before the "Descent from the Cross," you can only wonder that you ever dared to criticise the master? It is not strange, therefore, when the most important national galleries do not always show you the real Rubens, that the directors of the New Gallery, borrowing where they could, have succeeded still less well. The big canvases they have collected together are mostly fine theatrical exercises, tremendously skilful *machines*, which the cleverest contributor to the Salons could not hope to rival. Of one, the "Daniel in the Lion's Den," belonging to the late Duke of Hamilton, it seems Rubens himself wrote from Antwerp: "Daniel amidst many lions taken from the life—original, the whole by my hand." But this is hard to believe, powerful as is the drawing of the lions. The Daniel, in his excess of terror, is melodramatic, and there is no splendor of composition, no glory of color, as in the "Paris" and the "Rape of the Sabine Woman" in the National Gallery. Indeed, were it not for a series of sketches, for his pictures, and for tapestry and a number of drawings, the student would have to go promptly from Regent Street to Trafalgar Square to remind himself of what good reason there really is for the fame of Rubens. The New Gallery, with the best will in the world, offers but a reminder, useful at the moment, of this greatest of the Flemings, who was Van Dyck's master.

But, if the National Gallery contains some of Rubens's masterpieces, it is far from doing justice to Van Dyck. The large equestrian Charles is there, and a fine portrait, but little else of note, while the Academy now gives such a chance to study him at his best as cannot soon occur again. It is hardly necessary for me to go very much into detail; it is only a few months since I was writing of Van Dyck in Antwerp, and all the masterpieces that were there reappear on the walls of Burlington House. Here again are the "Carew and Killigrew," the "Royal Children," with other pictures from the Queen's collections; here the Hermitage "Lord Wharton"; here the "Henrietta Presenting the Laurel Wreath to Charles," the "Earl of Arundel," belonging to the Duke of Norfolk, with several versions besides of that most generous of all Van Dyck's patrons; the painter's portrait of himself in his youth, and the other with a sunflower, still more deliciously affected, of a later period. And there are pictures not shown in Antwerp, quite as important. Only the big religious subjects, lent so reluctantly by Belgian convents and churches, are missing, but no work of Van Dyck could be spared so readily. They illustrate a certain stage in his career; they add nothing to his reputation. Altogether, the collection, which includes also a large number of interesting and characteristic drawings, is more fully representative of Van Dyck during his most distinguished periods than was the series at Antwerp.

Nevertheless, I find that the impression it makes is the same. If Van Dyck could sometimes show himself the supreme master, in a painting like the perfect "Carew and Killigrew," for instance, or a dozen others, he was far oftener content—with Rubens—to be the accomplished director of a picture

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manufactory. His "Charles" and his "Arundel" and almost all his portraits of the artists and students and writers of his day prove his delight in the rendering of character when he discovered it in his sitters. But probably the expression of strong character was the one thing with which the lords and ladies who crowded to his studio could dispense, and so to him and to his assistants they became charming lay models upon which to drape a gorgeous costume, puppets to pose picturesquely. How lifeless they are, these pretty dukes and earls and marquesses, these great ladies in their silks and laces, with their pet dwarfs or tiger cubs at their sides! Van Dyck—again with Rubens—suffers from his own carelessness of his reputation, from his willingness to lend his name to all the work manufactured in his shop.

After Van Dyck, in his own country, came the decadence. But in England, the country of his adoption, there followed the growth and flowering of the first great school of English painters. The manner of this growth is not very clearly indicated at the New Gallery, excellent as is the intention. More than a century and several artists of great distinction separated Reynolds and Gainsborough from Van Dyck. The presence of Hobson and Walker, then of Lely and Kneller, who, though influenced by Van Dyck, became in their turn an influence, and of Hogarth, would have helped to bridge over the interval. It might have been wiser to limit the English work, since so little of it is exhibited, to portraits. It is always a pleasure to see the landscapes of Wilson and Constable and such a noble example of Turner as the "Walton Bridges." But these we owe to a very different influence, and they interrupt, instead of helping, the historical sequence. However, there are several fine Reynoldses, and Gainsboroughs, and Romneys; Reynolds's "Mrs. Nesbitt as Circe," with its forced, artificial, and very superficial allegory, showing how all that was most affected in the conventions of Van Dyck's latest period survived not only in Lely and Kneller, but in the English portrait-painters of the very end of the eighteenth century. Lawrence and Raeburn, who is but beginning to be appreciated as he should be, carry on the tradition to its decadence and final disappearance. For, surely, the inspiration of the few distinguished English portrait-painters of to-day comes not from Flanders, but from France. One or two men have tried to revive the old conventions, which, however, have proved empty and dead in their hands.

Until three years ago, with the Leighton exhibition, the Academy showed the Old Masters of many groups and schools, while never before this winter has the New Gallery sought to work in harmony with it. But so much has been accomplished by this joining of force, and by this representation of only one school or artist, that it seems to me the Royal Academy and the New Gallery have but to continue the present policy to make their winter exhibitions in the future still more delightful, and profitable too.

N. N.

RÉBELLIAU'S BOSSUET.

PARIS, December 25, 1899.

Bossuet will always remain one of the commanding figures of French literature and a model of style in the French language. There is in language a law of development and a sort of organic growth; Bossuet's style remains the perfection of the language of the seventeenth century. It belongs to the *grand siècle*, and cannot be separated from it; and whatever changes time may bring in the formation and expression of ideas, it will be an object of admiration for future generations. M. Alfred Rébelliau has applied himself to a special study of Bossuet's work, and has just added a valuable volume to the excellent collection of "Les Grands Écrivains Français" of Hachette. It will be read with pleasure, even after the works of Floquet, 'Études sur la vie de Bossuet,' 'Bossuet Précepteur du Dauphin,' of Gandar, 'Bossuet Orateur' and 'Choix de Sermons de la Jeunesse de Bossuet,' and the 'Œuvres Oratoires de Bossuet' published by the Abbé Lebarq.

Bossuet was born in 1627 at Dijon, at the time when a sort of Catholic revival, under the influence of François de Sales and of Bérulle, had begun. In his native province of Burgundy this revival was very marked. Bossuet's family was of humble origin; his ancestors had been drapers at Seurre, a small town of Burgundy. In 1517, one of them held a municipal office, and abandoned the old sign-board of the Bossuets, a vine with the device, "Bois boussu est bon," for the arms afterwards borne. The Bossuets became members of the parlements. The father of the illustrious Bishop was Councillor at Metz; he was a strong royalist and an ardent Catholic.

Bossuet was educated at the Collège de Navarre in Paris, and left it after the most brilliant examinations. His family had provided him, while still a child, with a canonry at Metz, but in the seventeenth century the obligation of residence admitted of many exceptions. The masters of the Collège de Navarre urged Bossuet to remain with them. He resisted their entreaties, and left for Metz, where he remained seven years, or until he was thirty-two. He arrived in a place which was in a miserable condition. The Spaniards and the Lorrainers were constantly devastating the neighborhood. Bossuet was at once appointed deputy of the chapter in the Municipal Assembly of the three orders, and was chosen to negotiate an armistice with the agents of Condé, who was at the time in the service of Spain. He left Metz in September, 1653, with a drummer to enter the enemy's lines. He thus immediately took his place as a man of action, and such he essentially remained all his life. He was always busy in directing religious communities or establishing seminaries. He was an indefatigable preacher. He was naturally eloquent, and his eloquence had always an end. He was also a great reader, and the germ of all his great works can be found in the studies he pursued at Metz and in his earliest sermons.

As soon as Louis XIV. became the real ruler of France, he aimed at the utter destruction of Protestantism in his kingdom. His predecessor, Louis XIII., had made war on it in the field; under Louis XIV. the war was carried on by the theologians. Bossuet entered the lists with ardor; his book entitled the 'Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine on Matters of Controversy,' composed in 1671 for the instruction of Turenne, of Dangeau, and of the Marquis de Lorges, made an immense sensation. In 1678, he was invited by Mademoiselle de Duras, a niece of Turenne, to confer and discuss with Claude, the most famous Protestant minister of the time. This debate recalled the famous discussion of Duplessis-Mornay and Cardinal Du Perron under Henri IV. In 1669, Bossuet was named Bishop of Condom, and soon afterwards, in 1670, Louis XIV. chose him as preceptor of the Dauphin. Putting aside sermons, controversy, funeral orations, Bossuet gave himself up wholly to his new task; he tried to make a king of France, a Christian king, who should be an honor to France and to Christianity. His pupil, alas, was a most ordinary and mediocre man, but Bossuet's time was not lost to the world, as his lessons took the shape of books which have been read by many generations.

The son of Louis XIV. and Marie Thérèse inherited from his mother a sort of heaviness almost amounting to vulgarity. A virtual king, he feared nothing so much as public life and diplomacy. He was brave and good, kind to those who lived with him, but careful to forget all that was taught him; he read only the births, deaths, and marriages in the *Gazette de France*. He spent whole days lying on his bed at Meudon, where he buried himself, away from Versailles, a cane in his hand, tapping his boots or playing with his snuff-box. What a pupil for a Bossuet! Bossuet, at least, profited by the education which the Dauphin received; he entered upon new studies. He was forty-three years old when he began to give lessons to the Dauphin, but he himself learned a great deal. He read Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato, Polybius, Strabo, Homer, Hesiod, Livy, Cicero; he became more familiar with the classics. His views on philosophy and policy became enlarged; he even opened the door to Descartes, though Descartes was denounced by the Jesuits as an accomplice of Calvin. He studied history in the original documents.

His polemical life began in 1673, when appeared the 'Critical History of the Old Testament,' by a learned Oratorian, Richard Simon. A friend sent it to Bossuet, who saw in this exegetic work "a heap of impieties," and denounced it to Chancellor Le Tellier. After a brief examination of it, orders were given to burn all the copies. Richard Simon treated the text of the Old Testament as an ordinary text, with the curiosity of a critic who means to have everything explained and verified. This scientific exegesis was a great novelty at the time, and seemed sacrilegious to Bossuet. Later, in 1680, he was much grieved at the publication of Malebranche's 'Traité de la Nature et de la Grâce." He wrote on the book "nova, mira, falsa."

In 1682, Louis XIV.'s policy was the cause of great embarrassment to him. The Pope's relations with the King of France had become very strained. In 1681, Innocent XI. excommunicated vicar-generals appointed directly by the King in two bishoprics, and an extraordinary general assembly of the clergy of France met on this occasion. The King charged Bossuet to make the opening speech in this national council. Bossuet was a Gallican, he regarded the King as a holy being, a representative of God on earth, responsible to God alone. He hoped to bring back to Gallicanism the French Protestants, who were always denouncing the Ultramontane pretensions. His position was not easy; he wished the Prince to be independent of the Pope, without being himself a lay Pope. He accepted the task which was offered him. Joseph de Maistre

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considered Bossuet's sermon on "The Unity of the Church" which he delivered on opening the assembly a *tour de force*. For ten years Bossuet tried to reconcile the supremacy of the King with the supremacy of the Pope, but the Pope forced the King to capitulate. In 1693, Bossuet had, by order of the King, to compose for another assembly a form of retraction of the first Declaration of 1682—a retraction which the vicar-general had to sign in order to receive the papal bulls.

Bossuet had other battles to fight, against Jurieu, against Fénelon. The battle with Jurieu was occasioned by the publication of the famous 'History of the Variations in the Protestant Churches.' This and the 'Politique Tirée de l'Écriture Sainte' are the most important of Bossuet's works, which are still readable and are found in all libraries. As for his numerous theological pamphlets, written in answer to Fénelon or to the Jansenists, they have lost all their interest for us. In the 'Politique Tirée de l'Écriture Sainte' and in the 'Histoire des Variations' we have, so to speak, the nucleus of all the doctrine of Bossuet—*one* spiritual law, *one* temporale law. These two works are the studied code of absolute authority.

Bossuet found himself at one time in a sort of spiritual negotiation with Leibnitz. He wished to bring about a fusion of the Catholic Church and the Protestant churches, as well Lutheran as Calvinistic. A sort of written dialogue began between the great Bishop and the great philosopher. Bossuet insisted upon the necessity of a permanent doctrine and unity of belief. The Catholic doctor said: "This was believed yesterday, so it must be believed to-day"; to which the Protestant philosopher answered: "What if something else was believed the day before yesterday?" "Can you," asked Bossuet, "find a way to hinder your Protestant churches from being eternally variable?" To which Leibnitz answered in these famous words: "It suits us, Monseigneur, to belong to this moving and eternally variable church."

Bossuet's quarrel with Fénelon reminds one forcibly of Molière's verse:

"Tant de fiel entre-t-il dans l'âme des dévots?"

The very name of "Quietism" is almost forgotten, and we can hardly understand now the violence of the passions excited by the doctrine of Madame Guyon. Fénelon was condemned in Rome, but bore his defeat with admirable dignity; he was perhaps wrong in doctrine, but he struck in the heart of his contemporaries a chord of sentiment and sentimentality which was a sort of revolt against the harshness and severity of Bossuet.

Bossuet struggled to the end against what he considered the errors of the time. He preached also to the end, not only in his cathedral church, but in the smallest churches of his diocese. He began to suffer from the stone in 1700; in 1702, he bade good-by, on Easter Day, to his diocese. He continued to work hard in his episcopal palace, writing, correcting proof-sheets. He finished his 'Meditation on the Gospel,' his 'Explanation of Isaiah,' his 'Politique Tirée de l'Écriture Sainte.' When he died, on the 12th of April, 1704, Saint-Simon could write of him that "he died with his weapons in his hands."

Correspondence.

THE AUDITING OF M'KINLEY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: No historian who ever wrote has taken more frequent advantage of his position to make personal hits at the Administration of President McKinley than Tacitus, in delineating the imperialism of Rome. If I remember rightly, some of these thrusts have already been brought to the attention of your readers, but not the one which follows.

On the death of Augustus, his grandson, Postumus Agrippa, was immediately slain by a centurion detailed for that purpose. (It will be remembered that he was at the time on the island of Planasia, under sentence of banishment.) The centurion undertook to report to Tiberius, but was referred to the Senate, Tiberius disclaiming responsibility. Thereupon Sallustius Crispus, fearing the possible results of his own part in the slaughter, went to Livia, still in many respects the head of the house, as she had been during the last years of Augustus, and warned her that Tiberius should not break the force of his imperial authority by bringing everything before the Senate. "For," he added, "it is a fundamental fact of imperialism that its accounts will not balance if submitted to more than one auditor."

That fundamental fact seems to be fully appreciated by our modern imperialists, who seem determined to give the people full information on no fact of real importance until that information is wrested from them by a pressure which can no longer be safely resisted.

W. H. Johnson.

"THROW OVER BRYAN."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Believing that the *Nation* likes to know facts, I take the liberty of saying just how a sentence in No. 1801 strikes me. The sentence is this: "Why not throw over Bryan with the free-silver issue?"

I am a teacher, and take no part in politics except to vote. I want Bryan renominated by the Democrats because I believe that he is opposed to the tariff and to monopolies of all kinds; because I believe that he is not dominated by the influences that rule McKinley and Hanna. You must find us another man before you say, "Throw over Bryan."—Very respectfully,

J. H. Dillard.

Tulane University, New Orleans,
January 6, 1900.

[But we are equally ready to say, "Throw over McKinley with the imperial programme."—Ed. Nation.]

OUR NEW DIPLOMACY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Educated opinion is, I take it, the same in all parts of our country as to the wretchedness of boss rule and the difficulty of overthrowing it because of our lazy good-nature. It does seem a little too bad, however, that those of us who are working in Europe should be hampered by shoddy politics in America. Advanced study in classics and in certain forms of art does not, at first sight, seem to be related to the question of the Italian immigrants who arrive in New York, but we here are suffering from an unwillingness on the part of the Italian Government to go out of its way to be friendly to representatives of a country by whom Italy has recently been treated with extreme discourtesy.

The story (which I have from the highest Italian authority) begins with the passing of our present immigration law, part of which was framed, as every one knows, with the sensible intention of preventing pauper aliens from entering the United States. When this law was passed, the Italian Government, in order to assist both her own people and the United States, came to an informal agreement with the authorities at Washington, in accordance with which an office in charge of authorized Italian officials was established on Ellis Island. At this office the immigrants were given whatever information was needed by them, and assisted to defend themselves from the padrone. In case question arose as to any immigrant fulfilling the requirements of the law, the officials in charge of the office were in a position to give our Government information that could be acquired in no other way.

This took place before Mr. McKinley was elected President. It was a system that worked excellently, and both parties to the agreement derived considerable benefit from it. The dullest imagination can perceive what a blessing it must have been to the immigrants. When Mr. McKinley became President, Mr. Powderly was put at the head of the Immigration Bureau. Owing to the hostility of the trades-unions to foreign immigration, Mr. Powderly did his best to get the office on Ellis Island abolished, and the Italian Government was informed that the office must be closed. Though the agreement to which the office owed its existence had been informal, yet the work done by it had been so satisfactory that the Italian Foreign Office was surprised, and begged earnestly for an adequate explanation of our action. As there was none to give, and as, being at war with Spain, we did not desire to increase the number of our enemies, the matter was dropped and the office continued its beneficent work.

Lately the affair has been taken up once more, and the Italian Government has been finally told that the office would be abolished, the reason being that other nations were asking to be allowed to establish similar bureaus, and we cannot give this right to everybody! That other European nations should be demanding this permission is an incontrovertible proof of the excellent service of the office, but apparently our Washington sages think that, like Polycrates, we had best throw some precious possession into the sea.

But greater even than the wisdom of our Solons is their courtesy, for this was the manner of their notification to the Italian Government. Early in December the Government here was informed, through the Italian Ambassador in Washington, that the office was to be done away with. The Marquis Visconti-Venosta, Minister of Foreign Affairs, asked (using the telegraph) that no final action be taken until the authorities at Washington had studied the papers he desired to send them. The papers were sent, but the reply received by cable at Rome before their arrival in Washington was that the office would be closed on Janu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ary 1—papers or no papers. The exact language I am unable to quote, but the abruptness of the decision is evident. The exact feelings of the Italian Foreign Office were left by my Italian informant to my imagination.

Up to the present time the Italian press has scarcely commented on the subject, for the Marquis Visconti-Venosta, knowing its supersensitiveness on certain points, has kept the matter dark. One writer has, however, asked if this case is to be taken as a sample of our "new diplomacy." It is to be hoped that, before the press begins irrational attacks either against us or the Italian Foreign Office—attacks which would render the wise settlement of the affair more difficult—the matter will have been reconsidered at Washington from the point of view of common sense and not that of the next election. RICHARD NORTON.

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES,
ROME, December 27, 1899.

OUR TITLE TO THE PHILIPPINES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Imperialists speak of the Filipinos as being in a state of insurrection. An insurgent is one who resists by force constituted authority and attempts by arms to overthrow an established government to which he owes obedience. That the Filipinos, who once were Spanish subjects, became insurgents against Spain by contracting an alliance with the United States, cannot be denied, but resistance to the extension of American sovereignty over the Philippines is not insurrection, as they have never been subject to the dominion of the United States. Aguinaldo's Government was the legitimate successor of the Spanish, and was organized and in control of the islands long before the pretended cession to the United States. As Spain had already lost control of the territory, and the United States had never attempted to exercise even military authority (before the treaty was signed) outside the limits of Manila, clearly the Filipinos could not be in insurrection against a power that did not exist.

By the terms of the protocol, the United States was to hold Manila pending negotiations for the disposition of the Philippines. Of course, any attempt by the United States to extend its authority during the suspension of hostilities might be a breach of the conditions of the protocol and a violation of public faith. The agreement provided that the situation in the Philippines should remain unchanged until a treaty of peace was concluded. The mere signing of the treaty by the Commissioners gave it no operative force before the exchange of ratifications. Yet on December 21, 1898, when the treaty had not been ratified and had no more legal force than a blank sheet of paper, and in defiance of the protocol, the President wrote to the Secretary of War:

"With the signature of the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain by their respective plenipotentiaries at Paris, on the 10th instant, and as the result of the victories of American arms, the future control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Islands are ceded to the United States. In fulfilment of the rights of sovereignty thus acquired, and the responsible obligations of government thus assumed, the actual occupation and administration of the entire group of the Philippine Islands became immediately necessary, and the military government heretofore maintained by the United States in the city, harbor, and bay of Manila is to be extended with all possible dispatch to the whole of the ceded territory."

The same day a cable order was sent to Otis: "The President directs that you send necessary troops to Iloilo to preserve the peace and protect life and property." Life and property were then as safe in Iloilo as in Manila. Peace was preserved and life and property protected by bombarding the town. The proclamation was a declaration of war against a people who had been organized and armed by the United States as allies in the war with Spain. It assumed foreknowledge of the fact that there were Senators who would speak against the treaty, but who would stultify themselves by voting to ratify.

It is a well-settled principle of public law that the national character of territory ceded by treaty continues unaltered until the treaty has been executed. As long as it remains executory, and there is no delivery of possession, the sovereignty is unchanged. Such a thing as sovereignty without possession cannot be conceived. This would have been the legal effect of the treaty even if Spanish power in the Philippines had not been extinguished and there had been no organized opposition to the transfer of sovereignty to the United States. The word *cede* means to yield or surrender title to something. But Spain had been divested of all title and had nothing to yield or surrender. Twenty millions were simply given as a soothing syrup to console her.

There is no analogy between a title acquired by private contract and a cession of territory. A citizen may convey property in the adverse possession of another, because the Government is the guarantor of its enjoyment by the grantee if the title of the grantor is good. In such a case the supreme power of the State provides a tribunal to try the right and execute its decree. But contracts *inter gentes* have no such sanction because there is no common political superior to enforce them. What is called international law is not law in the municipal sense of law. It is a mere ethical code, not a positive institution. Nations in their intercourse respect it, but there is no civil remedy for a violation of it. Redress must be sought by negotiation, or war. Hall, on International Law, says: "As international law is destitute of any judicial or administrative machinery, it leaves states which think themselves aggrieved and which have exhausted all peaceable methods of obtaining satisfaction, to exact redress for themselves by force." Law is defined by Blackstone as the command of a superior to an inferior. But among sovereigns there is no inferior—all are equals. Hence there can be no such thing as sovereign right without sovereign possession.

The cession of Louisiana is a case in point. It was a province of Spain, and by a secret treaty was ceded to France in 1800, but there was no transfer of possession until 1803. In the case of the *Fama*, 5 C. Robinson 107, Sir William Scott held that the national character of the inhabitants of Louisiana was not changed *ipso facto* by the treaty, and that Louisiana continued to be Spanish territory until it was actually delivered to France. There was war between England and France, and a vessel cleared from New Orleans with a cargo belonging to a merchant there resident, and was captured on the voyage. It was contended for the captors that, as domicile in war is a test of national character, it was enemy's property because Louisiana, having been ceded to France, was no longer neutral territory. The case turned upon the nationality of Louisiana. If it was French, the property was liable to condemnation as prize of war. Sir William Scott (Lord Stowell) said:

"The present question is a general one respecting the situation in which the people of a distant settlement are placed by a treaty of the state to which they undoubtedly belong, and by which they are stipulated to be transferred to another Power. The case proceeded for a considerable time without dispute as to principle on a mere inquiry into the fact of possession; under an understanding, as I apprehended, that if possession had not been taken by France, the French character could not be deemed to have attached. The question has, however, now been fully argued as to the principle of law, whether the treaty did not in itself confer full sovereignty and right of dominion, and whether the inhabitants were not so ceded by that treaty as to become immediately French subjects. The other question of law, how far full sovereignty can be held to have passed by the mere words of the treaty without actual delivery, was in the first stages of this cause not mooted. It is to be observed that all corporeal property depends very much upon occupancy. With respect to the origin of property this is the sole foundation. So with regard to transfer, it is universally held in all systems of jurisprudence that to consummate the right of property a person must unite the right of the thing with possession. I am of opinion that, on all the several grounds of reason or practice and judicial recognition, until possession was actually taken the inhabitants of New Orleans continued under the former sovereignty of Spain." Judgment for claimant.

The doctrine of this case was affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in Davis vs. the Police Jury of Concordia, 9 Howard 280. The Court said (p. 292):

"The *Fama* sailed from New Orleans in April, 1803, for Havre de Grâce with Spanish property on board. She was taken on the way by a British cruiser, and her cargo libelled, it being alleged to be enemy's or French property only upon the ground that Louisiana had been ceded by Spain to France before the *Fama* sailed. The points stated in the words of Sir William Scott are, whether the treaty did not in itself confer full sovereignty and right of dominion to France, and whether the inhabitants were not so ceded by that treaty as to become immediately French subjects. The cause was fully argued on both sides by as able counsel as were in that day or since in the admiralty courts of England. The cargo was restored to the Spanish claimant on the ground that the national character of a place agreed to be surrendered by treaty, but not actually delivered, continues as it was under the character of the ceding country."

According to these decisions, even if there had been no contest with the Filipinos until possession had actually been delivered to the United States, their national character would continue to be the same as when the treaty was signed. But the cession was absolutely void because, at the date of the treaty, Spain did not possess the sovereignty of the islands, and hence had no power to cede. She had no right to cede what she could not deliver. Spain's sovereignty in Louisiana was undisputed, but, in the Philippines, it had been wrested from her by the people she undertook to sell. The Filipinos were in actual control everywhere but in Manila. If the United States acquires possession of the Philippines, its title must rest not on cession from Spain, but on the conquest of the Filipinos. We bought nothing from Spain but a hole in the sky.—Respectfully, JNO. S. MOSBY.

SAN FRANCISCO, January 7, 1900.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THINGS ATHENIAN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The old Greek adage, that it is not given to every one to visit Corinth, still holds good as regards Athens in modern days. The tide of American travel still flows from Italy past the peninsula of Greece on to Constantinople or to Egypt without touching at Patras or the Peiræus, and the American colony at Athens is not yet so numerous as to be promiscuous. On returning to Athens after an absence of twelve years, one is impressed with the rapid strides the capital of Greece is making towards becoming a handsome city. Private residences as well as public edifices are built of Pentelic marble in part if not throughout, and the neighboring quarries are yielding an ever-increasing profit to the English company that has purchased a large part of the old mountain. The lesser and nearer heights, such as the Hill of the Muses and Lycabettus, are scarified and mutilated by the constant demands upon them for building material, and the day is close at hand when their outlines, if not their very existence, will be wiped out, unless the Government puts a stop to this wholesale destruction. The city is also losing its semi-Oriental character and becoming more commonplace. Fustanellas and fezzes are comparatively rare sights, and one must go down into the older portions of the city, near the Tower of the Winds and the Stoa of Attalos, to see and to hear the characteristic sights and sounds of the Athens of twenty years ago.

One is surprised to notice so few traces of the effects of the late war with Turkey. Some of the Greeks speak of the affair as a mystery, more look upon it as a stupendous political blunder, and all get some comfort from the outcome, which has given to Crete a popular and intelligent Greek prince as Governor. One indirect effect of the late war is especially deplored, and that is public begging, which, before this, was hardly known in Greece. This, doubtless, is a remnant of the public charities that were instituted during the war to care for the refugees who sought shelter in Athens.

The Boulé has just begun its session. There is prospect of lively discussion, though the Government party has a good majority. One of the most important questions to come before the Chamber of Deputies is the increase of the supply of water for Athens, which is a growing necessity. There is a curious lawsuit pending on which the whole matter seems to hinge. The late Mr. Syngros, after providing for his family, left the bulk of his property to charitable objects, making a certain benevolent organization his residuary legatee, but naming the sum which he expected it to inherit from him. But it turns out that his estate is worth upwards of a million of drachmæ more than he had supposed. The widow now sues to have this surplus revert to her, with the understanding that, if the courts decide in her favor, she is to present this amount to the Government for the new water supply. The sum required will be much larger than the amount of this bequest in litigation, but the Government hopes that, with this amount in hand, the needed work can at least be initiated.

Another matter that is likely to agitate the Boulé relates to forming a closer connection with the rest of Europe. The most feasible plan is to extend the railway from Larissa in Thessaly to Salonica, and there form a junction with the line from Constantinople to Vienna. That communication by rail with Western Europe would be of great advantage to Greece cannot be doubted. The difficulty in the way is the needed concessions from Turkey, through whose territory a large part of the proposed road would run. Just now, however, the Sultan is showing a friendly disposition towards Greece, and there is reason to hope that such a concession may be obtained.

Then there are questions of constitutional and financial reform to be discussed. To be sure, such questions are always at the front in Greece, but they seem to be unusually urgent at present, and it is said that the Ministry is determined to accomplish something of note in that direction. One of these reforms is the abolition of the vexatious octroi duty between the Peiræus and Athens.

Most of the temporary residents from Northern Europe and America are drawn here by the opportunities for archæological study and exploration. There are now five schools for classical and archæological study in Athens, the latest born being the Austrian Institute. They maintain most friendly relations with one another, and all enjoy the hospitable favor of the Greek Government and its officials. The Germans, under the auspices of the Berlin Museum, are digging in Miletus, the Austrians in Ephesus, the English in Crete, and the Americans hope to resume work at Corinth. The British School has recently fallen heir to a library "bonanza." The library of the late Dr. Finlay, the historian, containing upwards of 4,000 volumes, has been presented to it. This library is especially rich in books and pamphlets on the history of Greece during the Byzantine and Frankish periods, and contains a number of personal memoirs in manuscript and letters from distinguished men that have never been published.

Our American School has entered upon the nineteenth year of its existence. Its twelve students, representing ten different colleges and universities, are at present enjoying the privilege of hearing Dr. Dörpfeld once a week talk, as only he can talk, on the recent excavations about and on the Acropolis. In addition to the exercise in epigraphy with Prof. Herbert W. Smyth of Bryn Mawr, they enjoy occasional lectures from Dr. Wilhelm of the Austrian Institute. To this is to be added the weekly visit to the rich collections of sculptures in the museums under the skilful guidance of the Director of our School, Prof. Rufus B. Richardson. If the friends and patrons of the School could see for themselves the enthusiastic work that is done here, they would value still more than they do the helpfulness of this School in training the future teachers of classical studies in our country. The desirableness of putting the School on a permanent financial basis is patent to every one who knows its history and the worth of what it is doing. The time is ripe for the completion of its endowment, which has already made so good a beginning.

The excavations at Corinth are at present suspended, partly to await more favorable weather, but also for lack of funds. The last discovery made on that site is the spring of Glauké, not far from the old temple, which, as we have now learned, was not the temple of Poseidon, but of Apollo. It is to be hoped that the appeal of Mr. Richardson in your columns last August for financial aid to resume these interesting explorations will not go unheeded. The discoveries made by our School during the past decade at Sicyon, the Heræum, Icaria, and Corinth are acknowledged by the leading scholars of Europe to be a great credit to our country, and give American scholarship a position which it has never held before.

The work of the Greek Archæological Society on and about the Acropolis is now finished. This is not the place to recount the many important finds that have been made on this site within the past few years. The old rock and its western declivity are now denuded of all Frankish and Turkish additions. The Acropolis is again a precinct of sanctuaries, though in ruin, and stands out above the modern city more rugged and severely beautiful than when its approaches were disfigured by bastions and bulwarks of modern construction. The Parthenon has still a scaffolding on its western façade to facilitate the work of placing supports and pieces of architrave and columns where time and bombs and earthquakes had wrought most ruin. It is expected, however, that this needed work of restoration will be completed in the course of a few months.

Martin L. D'Ooge.

Athens, December 18, 1899.

SUUM CUIQUE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your recent appreciative and discriminating notice of 'The Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism' accidentally misstates the respective shares of the collaborators in that work. If your reviewer's epitome of authorship by chapters be, in general, retained, it should read, "Theory of Criticism, History of Criticism (mainly by Prof. Scott), Theory of Art (partly by Prof. Gayley), Development of Art, Theory of Literature, Comparative Literature (mainly by Prof. Scott), Theory of Poetry, Historical Study of Poetry, Historical Study of Poetics, and Principles of Versification (mainly by Prof. Gayley)."

But it would, in truth, be impossible for the authors themselves to indicate exactly the contribution of each to chapters that have been ten years on the stocks; and, in their inability to make more definite apportionment of their labors, they are of a mind that the best parts of the book were written by both, and the worst by neither. Each is, however, generously disposed to appropriate whatever credit may be got out of it.—Yours sincerely, The Authors.

January, 1900.

BIBLE DICTIONARIES.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: What you say about a Bible Dictionary, with special reference to Prof. Davis's new book, suggests that there may be known to you some better work which would be adapted for persons "already wandering in darkness," or at least not "satisfied with the Princeton position." If such a book is on the market, will you not kindly print its title and publisher?—Respectfully,

Seth Greer.

January 6, 1900.

[Our correspondent's question is somewhat vague. If the book wanted is a dic-

Reference Collection
Lee College Library
Baytown, Texas
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary of the Bible on about the same scale as that of Prof. Davis (*i. e.*, a single, moderate-sized volume), we must reply that we know of none that can be recommended with any warmth. On the other hand, two *large* Bible dictionaries are being published at present, and each has excellent points. Of one of these, Hastings's 'Bible Dictionary' (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark), two volumes out of the four of which it is to consist have appeared. Of the other, the 'Encyclopædia Biblica,' edited by Drs. Cheyne and Black (The Macmillan Co.), only one volume has appeared, but it also will consist of four. We shall publish shortly an extended review of this last. Both books can be heartily recommended. The first will be the more valuable for non-specialists; the second will appeal most to the specialist, but even he will require both. In questions of Biblical theology Hastings easily leads —from Cheyne such matters are practically excluded; in details of exact scholarship Cheyne is richer. But if what our correspondent wants is not necessarily a dictionary of the Bible, but any book which will enable a layman to find his way in the present labyrinth of criticism, and to keep his head through it all, then we would advise him to try Dr. Washington Gladden's three books, 'Who Wrote the Bible?' 'Seven Puzzling Books,' and 'How Much Is Left?' These are not intended for the student, but for the plain man who cannot be satisfied with the old formulæ, yet who wishes to hold fast to the old truth.—Ed. Nation.]

DECISION WITHOUT REASONS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The question you put on page 37 of your last issue is answered by the following quotation from Mill's 'Logic' (8th ed., N. Y., 1881, p. 144):

"Almost every one knows Lord Mansfield's advice to a man of practical good sense, who, being appointed governor of a colony, had to preside in its courts of justice, without previous judicial practice or legal education. The advice was to give his decision boldly, for it would probably be right; but never to venture on assigning reasons, for they would almost infallibly be wrong." X.

DID PLATO ERR?

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Prof. White's note in your issue of the 11th inst., which seems to indicate that Goethe was a victim of the delusion that mistakes the last year of one century for the first year of the next, brings to my recollection a passage about Henrik Steffens in Hansen's 'Illustreret Dansk Literaturhistorie.' The passage runs as follows:

"New Year's eve, the 31st of December, 1800, found him at a court masquerade in Weimar. After midnight Goethe, Schiller, Schelling, and Steffens withdrew from the ball, and in an adjoining room drank champagne to welcome the new year. Goethe was jovial, Schiller held instructive discourse, Schelling was quiet, and Steffens found joyous entertainment in noting the various effects of the wine upon these great spirits."

This account, if accurate, saves Goethe from the imputation of having thought that there were only ninety-nine years in the eighteenth century.—Yours faithfully,

William Morton Payne.

Chicago, January 13, 1900.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: In spite of many provocations, I have so far abstained from writing to any periodical in regard to the beginning of the twentieth or any other century. But Prof. White's little note in this week's number of the *Nation*, which I saw a few hours ago, forces me to say that Schiller as well as Goethe soon gave up the idea of 1800 being the first year of the nineteenth century. The letters exchanged between the two poets during the latter part of that year show that, in the words of Düntzer ('Life of Schiller' [translated], page 403), "The confederates wished to celebrate the opening of a new century [1801] by theatric festivities for which Schiller was particularly active." However, "the Duke had declared against the Centenary" and "Schiller drew back in disgust." "On the last evening of the year and century they met at the masquerade got up by the Court. . . . After midnight the two poets, with Schelling and Steffens, retired into the side rooms, and had a pleasant talk over champagne."*

As to Heine's jest, it is, of course, as well known to Prof. White as to me that the poet did not state, in so many words, that he was born "on the *first of January*," but "in der Neujahrsnacht Achtzehnhundert," that is to say, as it were, between the 31st of December and the 1st of January. I should not speak of this in particular if I did not think that Heine got this century joke from the real date of his birthday, January 13, which, turned about, gives 31, so that originally the December day was uppermost in his mind. Hence, the wrong date of his birth, equally familiar to Prof. White, which was formerly found in so many books.

While I was writing these lines there reached me (irony of fate!) one of the new German century postal cards with a radiant sun and a big 1900 on it, besides the Germania on the embossed stamp, stamped, "1.1.00 2-3V," that is, freely to quote Heine, "in der Neujahrsnacht Neunzehnhundert." I need scarcely mention that the authors inform me of their being gathered "das alte Jahr scheiden zu sehen und das *neue Jahrhundert* zu empfangen." Of course, when we give up the 18.. in our correspondence, we have the *feeling* that a new century begins. But, notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged by the serious writers of Germany (*e. g.*, Brockhaus's 'Konversations-lexicon,' *sub* "Jahrhundert") that the new century begins with 1901. On pages 13 and 14 of Kürschner's well-known 'Jahrbuch' for this year is to be found a reprint from 'Der Bote aus Thüringen' (Schnepfenthal, 1800), entitled, "Wenn beginnt das neue Jahrhundert?" This should be sufficient to enlighten the Pope of Rome and the Emperor of Berlin.—Very truly, E. Leser.

Bloomington, Ind., January 13, 1900.

*Compare Düntzer, Goethe's Life II. 181, note on Schiller's New Year letter of 1800; also, Karl Heinemann, Goethe, II. 228, and the Schiller biography by Wychgram.

Notes.

The Macmillan Company's spring announcements embrace 'Democracy and Empire,' by Prof. Franklin H. Giddings; 'Politics and Administration,' by Prof. Frank J. Goodnow; a 'Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology,' edited by Prof. J. Mark Baldwin of Princeton; a 'Cyclopædia of American Horticulture,' by Prof. L. H. Bailey of Cornell; a second series of 'Studies in Literature,' by Prof. Lewis E. Gates; 'Makers of Literature,' biographical essays by Prof. George E. Woodberry; 'The Evolution of the English Novel,' by Prof. Francis H. Stoddard of New York University; 'The Men Who Made the Nation,' by Prof. Edwin E. Sparks; 'The Golden Horseshoe,' the story of American expansion, by Stephen Bonsal; "Source Readers of American History," volume i., 'Colonial Children,' by Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart; 'Extracts from the Sources of English History,' by Elizabeth K. Kendall of Wellesley; 'European Travel for Women,' by Mary Cadwalader Jones; 'Highways and Byways in Normandy,' by Percy Dearmer, illustrated by Hugh Thomson and Joseph Pennell; 'A History of Gothic Art in England,' by E. S. Prior; the first volume of a 'Dictionary of Architecture,' edited by Russell Sturgis; 'Dante Gabriel Rossetti,' an illustrated memorial of his art and life, by H. C. Marillier; 'The Life of Edward White Benson, Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury,' by his son Arthur Christopher Benson; 'More Letters of Edward FitzGerald,' edited by W. Aldis Wright; a 'Concordance to FitzGerald's Omar Khayyám,' by J. R. Tutin; and 'The Welsh People: Their Origin, Language, and History,' by Prof. John Rhys.

D. Appleton & Co.'s January announcements include Maspero's 'The Passing of Empires,' translated by M. L. McClure and edited by Prof. Sayce; the late David A. Wells's 'Principles of Taxation'; the fifth volume of Prof. McMaster's 'History of the People of the United States'; and 'The Comparative Physiology and Morphology of Animals,' by Prof. Joseph Le Conte.

Harper & Brothers will speedily publish 'Thackeray's Hitherto Unidentified Contributions to *Punch*,' by M. H. Spielmann, in a volume uniform with the recent "Biographical Edition" of the novelist.

'Three Men on a Bicycle,' by Jerome K. Jerome, will be published early in the spring by Dodd, Mead & Co., and Tolstoy's 'Resurrection' probably before next autumn.

The Abbey Press, No. 114 Fifth Avenue, announce 'Danger Signals for New Century Manhood,' by Edward A. Tabor.

A book will be made, by the Century Company, of Ernest Seton Thompson's 'Biography of a Grizzly,' already published in their magazine.

Henry Frowde will soon issue four volumes of classical texts in the projected series "Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis," viz., Thucydides, edited by H. S. Jones; Plato, by J. Burnet; Lucretius, by C. Bailey; and Tacitus, by H. Furneaux.

'Hazell's Annual for 1900' (London: Hazell, Watson & Viney) will be prized for reference on no account more than for its succinct chronicle of the Transvaal imbroglio, in its several stages, often with textual quotations from the dispatches. A small map accompanies the article. Useful sum-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maries, too, are those of the Commissioners' report on the Newfoundland French treaty shore question, and the report of the Royal Commissions on the licensing laws and local taxation. Other momentous subjects similarly illustrated are the Conference at The Hague, the Venezuelan arbitration, the Dreyfus affair, etc. The Annual is kept remarkably up to date. It notes the "all-well" condition at Ladysmith on December 1, and, under United States, tells of the Samoan agreement, the "open-door" negotiations with other Powers for China, and the death of Vice-President Hobart. The editor, in his preface, lays stress on the extension of the biographies which are one of the features of this publication; but we fail to discover in the American portion any of the new war lights of the past two years. All are eclipsed by Bryan—his wind power proving a better title to fame even than Capt. Mahan's sea power.

A portrait of President Eliot, etched by a foreign hand not unfaithfully, is the frontispiece to the ninth issue of the "almanac of the learned world," *Minerva* (Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner; New York: Lemcke & Buechner). A very handsome tribute is paid him by the editors, in an apology for deviating from their custom as to the choice of subjects for portraiture (among professors). They speak of the power, authority, and responsibility of American college presidents, among whom Harvard's head is "der hervorragendste und der Führer." The other new feature of this ever growing annual is a list of significant scientific congresses scheduled for the current year. These are arranged alphabetically according to the place of meeting, Paris being preëminently the common ground, with forty-three congresses (out of some hundred, we believe, appointed there during the Exposition), while only six are held elsewhere. Sometimes the programme and usually the chief officers are given.

It is a pity when a master makes sport for the Philistines. Dr. Green of Princeton is a Hebraist such as there are few in this country. He has upheld a lost cause with loyalty and ability; but he would have been well advised either not to publish his 'Introduction to the Text of the Old Testament' (Charles Scribner's Sons), or to subject it before publication to an exhaustive revision. As it is, it evidently consists of lectures compiled some considerable time ago and very inadequately brought up to date. It is, presumably, accidental that there is no reference to Driver's 'Introduction,' though his earlier views on some points which were afterwards modified in the 'Introduction' are given at length. Yet why the great plan of the Cambridge Septuagint should be ignored; why Tattam should be the latest Coptic scholar mentioned; why the elder Hoffmann (who wrote in 1828!) should be the authority quoted for the history of the Hebrew script; why Gesenius (*clarum et venerabile nomen*, but undoubtedly antiquated) should often be the leading and only authority—these all be hard questions. The book as it stands is a most grievous mistake.

The prospectus of a magazine to be "conducted on Twentieth Century ideas" by the Press Biographical Company, New York, is before us.

Mr. Charles F. Lummis may take a solid satisfaction in putting on his shelf the eleventh volume of his pictorial monthly *Land of Sunshine* (Los Angeles), both as one more triumph over the difficulties of establishing such a magazine on the Pacific Coast, and for its intrinsic return to his subscribers and readers. Besides the unfailing exhibition of the attractions of the Coast, and the literary articles in prose and verse, and the editor's own frank utterances on politics and books, we find in the half-year embraced in this volume a translation (never before made) of the whole of the Viceroy Revilla-Gigedo's Report on California, 1768-1793, and the beginning of a translation of Fray Zarate-Salmeron's Relacion concerning the "New Mexico" of his time, 1538-1626. This is the third in the important series of historical sources with which Mr. Lummis has freighted his pleasure-craft. Nor should we omit to mention his trenchant discussion of our treatment of the Indians, under the caption, "My Brother's Keeper." The note of industry implied in all this personal editorial contribution is striking indeed.

The movement of population in France continues to arouse discussion, and at the annual meeting of the Society of Social Economy, in December, M. Fournier de Flaix presented an elaborate essay on the subject. He attempted to show that the situation was not so grave as was commonly believed, but he was obliged to resort to arguments of the most recondite and even absurd character. He made the paradoxical statement that, during the nineteenth century, the population of France had increased more rapidly than at any other period; but this increase occurred almost wholly during the period of repose which followed the cessation of the wars of Napoleon, and since 1871 population has been either stationary or declining. M. Bertillon criticised the essay severely, but had nothing positive to suggest except the fantastic measures advocated by the National Alliance for the Increase of the French Population. This Alliance maintains that it is the patriotic duty of every Frenchman to marry and beget at least three children, and relies, in effect, on a system of bounties for large families. But it must be admitted that in so far as its measures contemplate a reduction of taxes, they are well conceived. There is some evidence that not only the population but also the wealth of France is declining, and unless the burdens of industry are lessened the decadence may become serious.

The introduction of the study of the Russian language in the continuation schools and in one of the gymnasia in Berlin has, of course, a more than purely educational significance, especially as this new departure coincides very closely with a movement among German manufacturers of machinery towards the establishment of permanent exhibitions of their products in Russian trade-centres. The young men availing themselves of this new opportunity are sons of high military and civil officers, and technical students, discerning in the land beyond the Vistula and the distant regions beyond the Obi a promising field of activity. The instruction is given by the official Russian interpreter at the Prussian courts and offices of state. The linguistic training of young Germans has long been recognized (by English chambers of commerce and other interested parties) as one of the principal causes of their successful careers in foreign parts, and, in consequence, of the rise of German trade and industry. Our own young men may as well take the hint.

The fourth annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science will be held in Philadelphia on April 19 and 20, with Corporations and Public Welfare for the general topic—*e. g.*, governmental control over public-service corporations (gas, street railways, water); the influence of corporations on political life; combination of capital as a factor in industrial progress; the future of protection.

The Secretary of the League of Social Service, No. 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, will, on application, furnish particulars regarding the proposed "Paris International Assembly" to be established in connection with the great Exposition. Its main feature, we are told, will be "the largest application yet conceived of the summer-school idea," and it will "help bring the right people to the various departments of the Exposition and to the Congresses," and provide the more serious-minded visitors with "expert guidance, rendezvous and information bureaus," lecture courses, excursions, and even private hospitality.

—In vols. lv.-lviii. of the 'Jesuit Relations' (Cleveland: Burrows Bros. Co.) we receive a premonition of the fact that this great series is drawing to its close. The formal Relations, which began in 1632 with LeJeune's vivid description of his first efforts among the Montagnais, end, in vol. lvi., with the second instalment of Dablon's Relation for 1671-72. Henceforth, we shall see no more of the carefully prepared reports which were either written or edited by the local superior at Quebec, and sent home to the French provincial to be printed at the press of Cramoisy. With the extension of the sphere of Jesuit influence, it has evidently become impossible for any one so to coördinate the dispatches from widely severed fields as to give the effect of unity. Accordingly, a new practice establishes itself, and the compact Relation of the year gives way to a collection of letters, which, however, as a rule, reaches the printer by the same stages which have been already noted in the case of the Relation itself. This change in the form of the reports is coincident with and represents the final broadening out of Jesuit missions. The characteristic feature of vols. lv.-lviii. (which cover the four years, 1671-1674) is transition from the dominating interest of Iroquois topics to matters connected with the Far West and the Far North. The names of Albanel, Allouez, Joliet, and Marquette all suggest new regions which the French were developing at the moment when Dablon sent in the last of the Cramoisy Relations. Of these four explorers, Albanel is probably the least known, and we shall accordingly refer to his journey in the Hudson's Bay country. Dablon says, in editing Albanel's journal, that "the famous bay to which Hutson gave his name," had long stirred the curiosity of the French and made them wish to know the land route thither. In 1671 purely geographical motives received an impetus from the report that foreign ships had arrived in the bay, and had opened up the peltry trade in regions where all fur-bearing animals abounded. Talon, the Intendant, accordingly thought it his duty to act promptly on behalf of the national interests, and the expedition which started from Tadoussac in August had more than his sanction; it owed its origin to his suggestion. A missionary, Albanel, was put at its head because, from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his intercourse with the Montagnais and Attikamagues, he could best converse with the northern tribes and explain to them the virtues of Onontio, besides the advantages which would result from trading with the French rather than with any other European race. Albanel, after a hard journey, reached Hudson's Bay only to find the English there before him. His narrative effectively disposes of the claim that the French were the first to establish posts on this northern sea.

—'How England Saved Europe' (Scribners) is the picturesque title of a work in which Dr. W. H. Fitchett rehearses the events of the Great War, 1795-1815. "England has saved herself by her exertions, and will, as I trust, save Europe by her example"; these last public words of Pitt are here forced to furnish both a title and a motto. We have only the first volume before us, but it can easily be seen that the three succeeding parts will also have a military character, and will be written in a spirited way from the British standpoint. "'I have made war upon you for twenty years.' Napoleon, with somewhat vague arithmetic, condenses into that brief sentence the chief aim of his great career as a soldier, the whole policy of his Empire. And the satire of history is illustrated by the fact that these words were spoken as a prisoner in the cabin of a British man-of-war, and to a couple of British officers by the greatest military genius the world has known since Hannibal, and who had fought against England as Hannibal fought against Rome; 'the man of a thousand thrones,' who had made and unmade kings, and entered well-nigh every capital in Europe in turn as a conqueror. His twenty years of war with England had landed him there!" There is a certain ring about the allusion to Hannibal which reminds one forcibly of the most famous paragraph in Dr. Arnold's 'History of Rome,' but we have quoted this passage to disclose the tone which Dr. Fitchett uses. He views the long duel as an epic struggle with a clearly defined Nemesis. From the moment when, "at half-past six on the morning of February 25, 1793, three battalions of the Guards, equipped for foreign service, were drawn up on the parade-ground in what is now the rear of the Horse Guards," a great catastrophe was preparing. From the very beginning Dr. Fitchett does not once lose sight of the end. He presents us with the spectacle of Napoleon standing on the deck of the *Bellerophon* even before he has described the main conditions of the contest. His first volume extends from the French regicide to the defence of Acre by Sir Sidney Smith. Thus the record is largely one of sea-fights, and the period has already been covered by Capt. Mahan. However, as Dr. Fitchett does not write for specialists, any profit which he may have derived from a study of the "Sea Power" series is in the nature of gain to his audience. Apart from the description of manœuvres at sea, where he can hardly escape following Mahan, he goes at some length into the state of the service, and discloses the spirit of mutiny and disaffection which existed at the very time when the most brilliant victories were being won. 1797, the year of St. Vincent and Camperdown, witnessed an almost incredibly large number of trials for mutiny and sedition. Dr. Fitchett is sympathetic towards ability wherever he finds it, and his entertaining style should give him a wide circle of readers.

—The late Dr. James Martineau, who died on January 12 in the ninety-fifth year of his age, was easily the first of English Unitarians for a period of more than fifty years before his death. Dr. Priestley is the only other of them whose fame is at all likely to rival his in the historical perspective. Martineau was not a good sectarian, and his coreligionists were often grieved because he lent himself so grudgingly to their sectarian organization. He was always glad to call himself a Unitarian, but unwilling to connect himself with organizations carrying a theological distinction in their names. On the eightieth anniversary of his birth, in response to the greetings of the National Conference of English Unitarians, he declared his "conviction that the true religious life supplies grounds of sympathy and association deeper and wiser than can be expressed by any doctrinal names or formulas; and that free play can never be given to these spiritual affinities till all stipulation, direct or implied, for specified agreement in theological opinion is discarded from the bases of church union." He did not hope for the disestablishment of the National Church, but for such reformation of it that it might include all aspects of sincere belief and earnest life. His influence was not confined to the Unitarian body. He had many readers and disciples in the National and dissenting churches, and the religious literature of England has had many clear reflections of his thought. A prominent writer in the Reviews for sixty years, contemporary with Carlyle and Newman and Mill and Darwin and Spencer, he had a leading part in all the greater controversies of the time, and the sweep of his learning and the keenness of his dialectic made him an antagonist whose youth nor manhood no man could despise. The most painful episode of his career was his misunderstanding with his sister Harriet, who enthusiastically adopted the philosophical and ethical opinions from which he had turned away. He maintained a rigid silence when assailed by Harriet's friends until the appearance of Mrs. F. Fenwick Miller's life of his sister in the "Famous Women Series." Then the superfluous assault upon his mother's memory elicited from him a sharp rejoinder. Harvard College gave him the degree of LL.D. in 1872, the University of Leyden the degree of Doctor of Theology in 1875, and Edinburgh University the degree of D.D. in 1884.

—Mr. Oliveira Lima, Secretary of the Brazilian Legation at Washington, has published a volume ('Nos Estados Unidos') of political and social impressions derived from a three years' sojourn in this country (Leipzig: Brockhaus.) His eleven chapters must not be judged as a symmetrical essay, for they are composed of articles contributed to the *Revista Brazileira* and of letters to the *Jornal do Commercio*. Mr. Lima gives us, therefore, first and current impressions, and is not concerned with proportion or closeness of texture. His review of American writers, for instance, filling some forty pages, devotes seven pages to Mark Twain and sixteen to John Fiske, who has seldom been praised by a more hearty admirer. Illustrative of his discursiveness is the occurrence, in the chapter entitled "Effects of Immigration," of a summary account of the contents of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in this city. Boston's Public Library, park system, and historical associations are also here touched off, in paragraphs which end with a parable of G. W. Steevens's about a Bostonian's likening Irish rule in his city to negro electoral supremacy at the South. A really pertinent fact, had it been known to Mr. Lima, would have been that the Irish citizens of Boston had far more to do with saving the old State-House from demolition than the blue blood of Beacon Hill. "Woman's Influence" is discussed with but incidental mention of woman's suffrage, and with no apparent knowledge of the origin of the agitation in favor of it. Similarly, lynching is little dwelt upon in the opening chapter on "The Negro Problem," nor is any notice taken of the tendency towards caste separation of the races in the new Southern industrial development. In that constant comparison of the two republics which is one of the writer's motives for publication, he remarks, on page 52, that such a law as that which prevails at the South, prohibiting intermarriage of white and black, could never be enacted or executed in Brazil. The peculiar form of crime which incites our Southern lynching, he adds, is not on the increase in Brazil since emancipation; but he stops short of suggesting that the abrogation of our Southern statutes against intermarriage would perhaps tend to reduce the frequency of the offence so much feared and so savagely avenged.

—The latest issue of the Berlin Royal Ethnological Museum's publications is again brimful of the best scientific matter. The first half of the sixth volume, just out, is taken up entirely with contributions to Mexican archæology made by Dr. Edward Seler. Of his "eighteen annual festive periods" of ancient Mexico the first section is presented in the last number, his principal authority being Bernardino Sahagun, a Franciscan clergyman who arrived in Mexico from León, his natal province, in 1529, and died in 1590. The circumstance that this author wrote but shortly after the conquest renders his descriptions especially valuable. Sahagun composed the twelve books of his 'Historia General de las Cosas de Nueva España' in the Nahuatl language. The two parts of it are now kept in two different libraries at Madrid, but the whole also exists in an ancient copy with fine illustrations, in part translated into Spanish. This manuscript was recently discovered in the Biblioteca Laurenziana in Florence, Italy, by Zelia Nuttall. What has been hitherto published of Sahagun's archæological work gives only a faint idea of the contents and the high value of the whole. The eighteen annual feasts discussed by Dr. Seler are based on the calendar which was common to the Mexican and Maya nations, and counted, to make up the year, eighteen sections of twenty days each. In Mexico a section was called *compoualli*, from the word for *twenty*, and each section had its own name, ceremonies, and sacrifices. In Seler's article the ceremonies attending every section are described by prefixing Sahagun's Nahuatl text, and then adding his own German translation with extensive comments, by which a full understanding is made possible.

—The subjects discussed in the two other papers of vol. vi., part 1, are of equal interest. One of them, "Pictorial Images of the Mex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ican Annual Celebrations," describes the feasts, ceremonials, pageants, and mummery attending these popular demonstrations, and may be regarded as a sort of abstract or recapitulation of the former article. The accompanying pictures are taken from various Nahuatl codices, but without the gaudy coloring of the originals. "Sorcery and Wizards in Ancient Mexico" is the title of another erudite article in the same fascicle. For ethnologic science the beliefs and symbolism of witchcraft are always instructive, and among primitive nations like those of Mexico the practice of medicine (or, say of healing) is intimately connected with sorcery and jugglery. As among our northern Indians, the members of the "faculty" belonged to several classes, and for Mexico Dr. Seler establishes four—the medicine men (*titici*), the soothsayers (*tlahpouqué*), the jugglers (*teixcuepanimē*), and the wizards or sorcerers proper (*nanualtin*), who were also forecasters or prophets, rainmakers, and producers of hallucinations. Many of them were doing their best to benefit the race, but others, probably the majority, were intent upon inflicting injury upon their fellow-men.

SEA-POWER ETHICS.

Lessons of the War with Spain, and Other Articles. By Alfred T. Mahan, D.C.L., LL.D., Captain United States Navy, etc. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. Pp. 320.

We have here a new volume in which are collected the essays that Captain Mahan has published in the past year. Five of them make a series which gives the title to the book. The other four treat of subjects more or less closely allied to the imperialist expansion, of which the author is a leading advocate. The essays upon the war with Spain are a very instructive and interesting analysis of the naval operations in the West Indies, and, considered as a discussion of the war as actually conducted, could not easily be improved. The author's professional knowledge and his study of the broader problems of naval strategy give lucid expositions of the recurring critical situations in the Caribbean Sea, while his position as member of the strategy board at Washington makes his explanation of the reasons which controlled the naval conflict authoritative. The efforts to advocate his imperialist theories are kept subordinate to the historical presentation, and do not challenge much debate. In the essay on Distinguishing Qualities of Ships of War we find also good professional treatment of the subject, skilfully adapted to popular comprehension.

The other papers may properly be treated as a politician's partisan advocacy of the imperialism which builds upon conquest the policy of assuming the rôle of a "great Power," in the European sense, asserting a potent influence in every world-controversy, and taking a hand in every scheme for the spread of empire. The essay on our Relations to our New Dependencies is a statement of principles of government, by a conquering Power, over dependent peoples, for their own good (from the conqueror's point of view). It is a summary of the policy which Great Britain has evolved from much painful experience, and, if rights of weaker communities to self-government are put among the exploded whimsies of our youth and the discarded "swaddling-clothes" of our infancy, the author's exhortations to be guided by "beneficence," as well as self-interest, do credit to his heart. If we must have despotism, by all means let it be the maternal despotism which Captain Mahan describes.

In the essay upon the Peace Conference and the Moral Aspect of War, we reach the discussion of fundamental principles of ethics as the basis of law, whether municipal or international. As to what the Conference of The Hague actually did, the author expresses a mild approval, when it is limited to the affirmation of the decision "that it is to arbitration men must look for relief [from the evils of war] rather than to partial disarmament, or even to an arrest in the progress of preparations for war" (p. 208). He sees, however, "cause for serious reflection when this most humane impulse is seen to favor methods which, by compulsion, shall vitally impair the moral freedom and the consequent moral responsibility which are the distinguishing glory of the rational man and of the sovereign state" (p. 209). He seems to have found in the Conference, and in the friendly discussion of the proposals before it, this tendency to put the duty to arbitrate international disputes among the agreed principles of international law, so that the conferring Powers consenting thereto might apply to future disputes that moral coercion to arbitrate which is now found in the other agreed principles, such as, for instance, the rule that you shall not slaughter your prisoners. This tendency, though it resulted in no action in the Conference, he finds it his duty to combat vigorously, lest the distinguishing glory of the sovereign state should be eclipsed. The philosophy upon which the contention is based is presented with formidable sea-power.

The first postulate laid down is that "one of the most unfortunate characteristics of our present age is the disposition to impose by legislative enactment—by external compulsion, that is—restrictions of a moral character which are either fundamentally unjust, or at least do not carry with them the moral sense of the community as a whole" (p. 209). The argumentative use of this is to create in the reader a readiness to rebel against legislative control. But in truth no period of the world's history has been so free from such an "unfortunate characteristic." Never has the tendency been so strong towards local and individual autonomy; towards freedom of thought and of action; towards liberty of speech and untrammelled locomotion; towards easy bonds of allegiance and liberal practice of expatriation. The postulate is a false assumption in fact.

The next step is to assert the right and the duty to follow one's own conscience, in obedience or disobedience to public law. One need have little quarrel with the proposition if enlightened conscience were properly distinguished from ignorant or ill-educated impulses; if the anarchical tendency of denying authority were fully weighed; if the obligation to preserve and respect human society were measured; if the presumptions in favor of law were not casually named, but soberly analyzed. So far from this being done, the author states, as the thing to be "carefully kept in mind," that it is not the "absolute right or wrong of the particular act, as seen in the clearer light of a later day," that justifies men in disobedience. "The saving salt which has preserved the healthfulness of the body politic has been the fidelity to conscience, to the faithful, if passionate, arbiter of the moment" (p. 212). To call such hasty, passionate action on the impulse of the moment conscientious, is a simple abuse of language. When a man is face to face with the choice between obedience to law or rebellion against it, passion and haste are the opposites of conscience, and most commonly used to silence its judgments. By such inversions of the meaning of terms, the absurd logic is easy by which the author concludes that making war for slavery is as conscientious as making war to resist it, and, after a holocaust of human lives and the desolation of half a continent, not only is nobody morally responsible, but the aggressors "made no small contribution to the record of fidelity to conscience and to duty which is the highest title of a nation to honor" (p. 213). To cap the paradox, he affirms, in the same paragraph, his agreement with Lincoln that "if slavery is not wrong nothing is wrong." His stunning conclusion is that the Slave Power would have been wicked not to make the war, because, "be it by action or be it by submission, by action positive or action negative, whatever is not of faith—of conviction—is sin." He omits to draw the final conclusion which his logic demands, that Nothing *is* wrong.

One would naturally suppose that the conclusion that men and nations may be equally conscientious on either side of the most bloody conflicts, nay, that they would "sin" if they did not fight on the side of the most plain and demonstrable of wrongs, would find its most evident corollary in the doctrine of general arbitration. In such a muddle it would seem wise beyond dispute to submit our differences to disinterested tribunals guided by standards of right which are based upon the assent of the ages, and so escape from the wars that must follow the imaginary dictates of a bogus conscience which may approve either side of a conflict between liberty and slavery, and which decides passionately and on the moment. Far from it. The logical stress only nerves the ethical philosopher to the dialectic feat of asserting that this conscientious judgment that right is wrong makes it wrong, and that "even the material evils of war are less than the moral evil of compliance with wrong" (p. 215). How consoling to the anarchist who threw his bomb into the French Assembly, and what a noble justification to our compatriot in Sulu who runs amuck that he may win the Moslem paradise! The final word of Jingo philosophy is, "It is not the accuracy of the decision, but the faithfulness to conviction, that constitutes the moral worth of an action, national or individual" (p. 216). The Sulu *juramentado* is faithful unto death, and Captain Mahan, if consistent, must echo the voice of Allah, Come thou blessed!

As is usual in self-deluding fallacies, having made an absurd definition of conscience, having divorced it from all criteria of right as recognized by the common judgment of mankind and left it to the impulse of the individual, true or false, strong or weak, wise or foolish, the author now slides back to the common notion of conscience as a God-given judgment in real accord with unselfish ideals and love to our neighbor. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"passionate arbiter of the moment" again becomes the diligent searcher of his own bosom, its motives and its standards, and the authority of such a deliberate, altruistic judgment is coolly transferred to the counterfeit. "Between God and man," he tells us, "no other arbiter comes; and if this be so, a pledge beforehand [to arbitrate] is impossible" (p. 220). He thus reaches the sad conclusion that a treaty agreeing to arbitrate future disputes is contrary to conscience, and, of course, wicked. He is willing to concede that there may be some mere interests, not involving conscience, which may be submitted to arbitration; but the door is so wide open to making anything a point of conscience that, even as to past differences, the field of arbitration is too narrow to waste time upon. The ancient, authoritative maxim of law, that "no one is a rightful judge in his own cause," is thus deposed in favor of the truly imperialistic one that everybody is his own sole judge, by divine right. If general war shall follow, the universal conflagration will only illumine and bring into stronger relief the moral grandeur of the resistance to coercion even to keep the peace; for compulsory arbitration assumes "a moral obligation to do or to allow a wrong" (p. 224).

From such a point of view it is not strange that peace should seem ignoble, and war rise to the dignity of a world's benefactor. "Step by step, in the past, man has ascended by means of the sword, and his more recent gains as well as present conditions show that the time has not yet come *to kick down the ladder which has so far served him*" (p. 230). We italicize the phrase which so charmingly characterizes the base ingratitude to War which is a crying sin of the present age. If any of us are so belated in progress as still to hold that the *gradus ad Parnassum* is found in peaceful education, developing ideas of the true, the beautiful, and the good, leading on to standards of justice heartily respected, and good will to our neighbor spontaneously exercised, we here find our deserved condemnation and correction. Swords, not ideas, are the rungs of the ladder of human progress. We are now taught that it was the sword, and not the vigorous growth of law, of letters, and of free religion, that made the land of Grotius the enlightened country it is. It was Philip's remorseless war upon its advanced notions in intellect and private conscience that was the praiseworthy cause of great good. If we have foolishly supposed that progressive enlightenment was the precedent condition of the high position the Dutch nation attained, and the sword was Philip's wicked instrument of oppression, let us hasten to correct our ignorance. If we have imagined that Philip and Alva were foiled, and that noble enlightenment survived in spite of (not by reason of) the Spanish bigot's war, though the sword was backed by the gibbet, the rack, and the stake, let us recant our misjudgment of the conscientious king, and glorify not only the sword but his other pious instrumentalities. If we have weakly thought that when the Ruler of the Universe "maketh the wrath of man to praise him," he does not thereby sanctify the wrath and transmute it into holiness, let us confess our error and be humbly thankful that, even at this late day, we have enjoyed the teaching of a professor emeritus of Jingo ethics. In our wicked effort to overturn the ladder of swords, we have only been "kicking against the pricks."

SMITH'S NEW TRADES COMBINATION.

The New Trades Combination Movement; Its Principles, Methods, and Progress. By E. J. Smith. With an Introduction by the Rev. J. Carter, M.A., Bursar of Pusey House, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 1899.

During the last seven or eight years a most significant movement has been making headway in business circles in England, especially in the Midlands, around Birmingham—a movement which has hitherto hardly attracted in this country all the attention it deserves. A certain Mr. E. J. Smith, evidently a man of original and masterful character, who had made his way up to the position of an employer through all the grades of journeyman, foreman, manager, and traveller, has managed to induce almost all the manufacturers in his own line of business, the metallic bedstead trade, to form a close combination of an altogether novel type. So successful has this "Alliance" proved, and so persuasive has been Mr. Smith's advocacy of his plan as applicable to any industry and a blessing to all concerned, that he has been invited to organize some half-a-dozen others among the smaller trades on the same lines. Now every few months some fresh combination or other is launched under his auspices.

All this has not happened without a great amount of opposition from recalcitrant manufacturers, and also of sweeping and bitter criticism in the public press. The editors of the English *Economic Review* were quick-sighted enough to perceive the possible significance of the movement. Mr. Smith was nothing loath to appeal to economists, and contributed a series of articles in explanation of his plan, the first on its general principles, the others on its relation to the workman, to the foreign competitor, and to the consumer, respectively; and it is these articles which have now been collected in a handy little volume, with an introduction by the Rev. John Carter, the able and energetic secretary of the Christian Social Union.

Mr. Smith is of opinion that the main cause of business distress in all its forms, and of the effort to reduce wages to make up for falling profits, or to ward off bankruptcy, is to be found in the temptation, to which manufacturers are exposed by the pressure of competition, to sell below cost. He asserts that, absurd as it may seem, a large number of manufacturers have in fact no definite and accurate notion of the cost of producing the articles they deal in. The first principle, therefore, on which he insists is the necessity of correctly "taking out costs." This is largely a matter for the accountant, though it involves several interesting questions to be referred to later. The next step is to induce all the manufacturers of a particular trade, after following certain common rules of cost-taking adjusted to the average business, to agree to fix the price of each article by adding a certain definite percentage of profit. So far there is nothing particularly new in the scheme. The difficulty has always been to hold the members of the association to the agreement: it has never seemed possible to get out of them a guarantee payment sufficiently large to make its forfeiture a serious consideration. One of the expedients to which similar combinations have had recourse in this country, namely, a compact with the transportation agencies, is impracticable in England; another, to wit, a system of discounts to buyers, is commonly inadequate. Mr. Smith's invention to overcome the difficulty is nothing more nor less than an open and avowed coalition with the workmen in the trade. He insists that where the men are not already organized they shall be formed into a union, and that the masters shall engage to employ no non-unionists, in return for the agreement of the union to work for no employer not belonging to the Alliance. Accordingly, a manufacturer who breaks away from the Alliance has to reckon, at the very outset, with a strike of his employees.

The assistance of the men is not obtained for nothing. The bargain between the two associations of employers and employed contains elaborate provisions for a bonus on wages in proportion to an increase in prices, and for a Joint Conciliation Board to settle all possible matters of dispute. According to a late Lord Mayor of Birmingham, the increase in remuneration has amounted in the bedstead trade to 25 per cent. The general results have been thus summed up in a characteristic speech by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain:

"In a trade in which every one, whether workman or employer, was dissatisfied, he has brought contentment. Wages, I believe, have been increased, profits have become larger, and, curious to relate, the demand and the production have increased at the same time. This experiment, I believe, is capable of great development. I understood, when I was last in Bradford, that a great trade in that city has agreed to adopt the principles upon which Mr. Smith has secured success. . . . I am always glad that a new light should proceed from Birmingham."

Even the Bedstead Alliance, however, is not yet out of the woods. It is true that the outcry against it would seem to have proceeded, not from the general public, but from the ironmongers and other middlemen who have hitherto been able to play off one manufacturer against another. For months there has been talk of the establishment of an opposition factory at Antwerp; but it is probably only talk. Yet it would be strange if a neighborhood so characterized by individual initiative as the Midlands submitted without a murmur to so singularly complete a system of regulation. And as it is, two manufacturers, one in Birmingham and the other near Manchester, were holding out at the date of our last advices.

Without speculating as to the distant future, it may be recognized that the new movement has hitherto enjoyed a very considerable measure of prosperity. Moreover, no one can have moved in English business circles of late, especially in Yorkshire and Lancashire, without realizing that combination is in the air. And as there are many masters who really value trades-unionism, and still more who feel they cannot get rid of it, it is very probable indeed that the early decades of the coming century will witness in England a whole series of attempts to create what may be called a vertical organization of the industrial field—to harmonize and formally associate all the interests in particular industries, from top to bottom, in the face of the rest of the world. We see no reason to question Mr. Smith's genuine regard for social welfare, and especially for the workingmen; we are ready to allow that the consumers affected by his alliances have suffered inappreciably; but the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plan is so full of potentialities that he must be patient with us if we insist on its weak point.

That weak point is the interest of the consumer. Mr. Smith is perfectly right in saying that the older school of economists paid too exclusive an attention to the consumer; he is right in urging that the workmen are themselves consumers. What is even more to the point, he is justified in his contention that in unrestricted competition there is no necessary safeguard for the consumer, inasmuch as recent experience goes to show that competition itself tends to the creation of monopoly. But the moral of all this is neither that the consumer can be disregarded, nor that the alliance plan is to be condemned. It is rather that the public should be given a good deal more definite information than they have yet received as to the details of the mechanism. What is the way in which the consumer tends to be protected under competitive conditions? It is that when the profits of a particular business are noticeably higher than in other industries, new men and new capital are attracted to it; and if prices continue too high, overproduction ensues, and then prices fall. This would be cold comfort in the case of many industries where only large capitals find an opening; but with the Birmingham trades, where businesses are still comparatively small, where there is a great deal of enterprise and money always on the watch for fresh opportunities, and where exceptional men can still rise from the ranks, it is a solid satisfaction. Will not Mr. Smith convince us of the persistence of this salutary check on excessive prices, in the bedstead trade for instance, by telling us the exact financial conditions of membership in his Alliance? Is it easy for a new man to enter the association? In order that the equalizing forces of individual enterprise should work at all rapidly, it must be possible to find out what profit is actually being made in the several trades. Will not Mr. Smith tell us what is the "fair interest" which must, in his scheme, be reckoned among costs of production? Will he not tell us how he reckons the "wages of management" which are similarly counted in? Will he not say what is the profit the Alliance adds to the production-cost of each article? As a bedstead-maker, Mr. Smith may hesitate to satisfy our curiosity; as a social reformer, we are convinced it would be his best policy in the long run. Certainly, if combinations continue to flourish, publicity of accounts will be the only alternative to state interference; and if it is not voluntary, it will be compulsory.

Memoirs of a Revolutionist. By P. Kropotkin. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1899.

It may be truly said of Prince Kropotkin's Memoirs that they offer a better all-round picture of a certain type of Russians in particular, and of the genuine aristocratic socialist and anarchist in general, than any other record in existence. The first part of the autobiography is not a whit inferior to Count L. N. Tolstoy's famous 'Childhood, Boyhood, Youth,' in its vivid limning of family and social life sixty years ago in Russia; indeed, it far surpasses Tolstoy's work in actual details, though the plucking up his thoughts and feelings by the roots to inspect their state of growth, preparatory to replanting and reinspection, is suggested, not minutely recorded as in Tolstoy's case. Many people, no doubt, will be shocked at the account of the treatment frequently dealt out to serfs, under the old régime, as intelligent Russians might be shocked at many occurrences during the old slave days in our Southern States; but the instances of good temper, fine feeling, and faithful affection narrated by the author offset the horrors, in that they furnish data for judging the general character of the peasants who (when properly educated) are destined to exercise a decisive influence upon the world. What is absolutely new is the description of life in the crack military school and the suggestively thorough training of Russian officers, which is of interest to foreign nations at present, especially to those which have too hastily taken universal ignorance for granted in that greatly misunderstood empire.

The author states, in his prefatory note, that he has added considerably to the original text (as it appeared in the *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1898-1899), in the parts dealing with his youth and his stay in Siberia, and especially in the part where he has told the story of his life in Western Europe. Such is the intense interest of the book that it is to be regretted he did not make two volumes, at least, and deal with the two halves of his life in a wholly satisfactory manner. As it is, we should be very glad to have an unstinted quantity of social pictures from so clever a pen, while more fulness of psychological study and of practical detail are certainly needed in the socialistic-anarchistic division to enable the reader to comprehend and pass just judgment upon Prince Kropotkin's aims and methods. For example, he mentions that, on his father's death and his inheritance of a large landed estate, he meditated putting in practice there the socialistic theories to which he had already dedicated himself; but, on being warned by competent persons that this would be impossible, he refrained. There the incident ends, so far as we are informed. He does not mention whether he left the estate to be administered on the usual plan, condemned by him, shifting the responsibility to a hired steward, or whether he sold it, and thus shifted the responsibility in a still easier manner; or what he did with the proceeds. Later on, when he records the efforts of himself and his fellow-anarchists to found a newspaper—an "organ"—he says that their combined funds amounted to about four dollars; and he constantly refers to some handicraft exercised by himself (nowhere specified), as a means of livelihood. Inevitably, the reader demands: "What had become of your estate? Why did not you remain in Russia and superintend the welfare of the peasants there resident, as many Russian landed proprietors actually do, even if you were unable to raise them to your level or lower yourself to theirs? And if manual labor is the sole means of salvation, why did you waste your time upon scientific work, however important to the world, however profitable to yourself?" There are many other questions that occur to the non-anarchist public, which does not clearly understand what aim the anarchists propose to themselves, unless it be to usurp the authority of the present powers, and dictate terms themselves in a more arbitrary manner.

It is a disappointment that Kropotkin has not seized the opportunity to elucidate this point, for it must be conceded that he possesses one incalculable merit over his late friend and ally, "Stepniak"—he is straightforward and convinced, he carries the tradition of his good birth and breeding into his revolutionary propaganda. Stepniak was plausible and convincing, to the uninitiated in Russian affairs. But his books would not bear careful reading, and too frequently contradicted in one chapter the specious arguments of a preceding chapter, or an ordinary knowledge of chronology sufficed to annihilate his most powerful anecdotes of illustration. In conversation he would state a matter strongly, with entire conviction, to all appearances, and announce plans of future action with the calm confidence of a mathematical professor. But if his interlocutor happened to understand Russia, her people and problems, and objected, "But that is not so, because," or, "You cannot work on that plan, for such and such reasons," Stepniak would yield, frankly and promptly, with a smile that was the apotheosis of the child-like and bland, with the remark: "No, we cannot; I see that you understand." Thereupon he would calmly proceed to repeat the manœuvre, as long as the time and the understanding (or ignorance) of his interlocutor permitted. Under such circumstances, belief in Stepniak's sincerity was difficult, to say the least. There is nothing of that sort with Kropotkin. We may trust his sincerity. He has proved it; he has abandoned his advantageous social position and revenues in Russia, and done actual labor, unlike some members of the British aristocracy who write socialistic articles and books on hearsay knowledge, because the topic is popular, and receive for their amateur efforts—plus their title—excessive payments, which are diverted from the pockets of genuine literary workers toiling for their bread.

As the best example of a non-introspective but intensely interesting life-story of a highly gifted and sincere man, Prince Kropotkin's volume merits a place in every library, even though it be not very convincing in its socialistic doctrines and attempted propaganda.

Elizabeth Pease Nichol. By Anna M. Stoddart. With portraits and other illustrations. London: Dent; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Pp. xi, 314.

This Life of Mrs. Elizabeth Pease Nicol fitly commences a proposed series, under the editorship of Robert F. Horton, of "Saintly Lives." We read (p. ix):

"It was a saying of Jowett, the late Master of Balliol, that more good would be done in the future by writing the lives of men and women who have deserved well of their kind, than by set treatises in theology and morals. The present series aims at being a contribution to such a service."

We agree with the editor in the suggestion that Protestants have, in the lives of passing and present humanity, more zeal and higher incentives to purity of thought and action than have other religionists in the lives of those whom, it is supposed, the Deity has been moved to set apart above ordinary conditions of life and death.

If to many who knew the late Mrs. Nichol some of Mrs. Stoddart's chapters may appear heavy, and if more personal incidents might have been looked for, it must be allowed that it would be difficult in print to give any real conception of the richness and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

loveliness of this Englishwoman's character. The reviewer's endeavor would be even more difficult than the biographer's. Born in 1807 of the best Quaker blood in England, Miss Pease married in 1853 Prof. Nichol, Astronomer Royal of Scotland. She was widowed in 1860, and survived until 1897. We are given three portraits of her. That which pleases us most is at the age of seventy, showing her still in the plenitude of her powers. Her features, seventeen years later, in their almost leonine nobility, might well be taken for those of Mr. Gladstone. From Quakerism—at its best, as we have said—her mind expanded, mainly under the influence of the anti-slavery movement, to the broadest Christianity. She was actively engaged in all the liberal philanthropic movements of her time. Either as guests at her father's house in Darlington, at her married home in Glasgow, or her final retreat at Huntly Lodge, Edinburgh, or in correspondence, there stud the pages before us the names of such men and women as Wilberforce and Clarkson, George Stephenson, O'Connell, Garrison, Phillips, Thompson, Harriet Martineau, and all the anti-slavery set; Cobden and Bright, W. E. Foster, Gladstone, John Dillon; Mazzini, Kossuth, and Garibaldi.

For American readers, the chief interest in Miss Pease lies in her intimate relations to the American abolitionists, and especially to their leader; and these have been set forth on an ample scale in the Life of Garrison, to whom she was in England what Mrs. Chapman was in America. Before his first visit abroad, however, she was already schooled in the cause by assisting her father and his associates in abolishing slavery in the British West Indies, as later in terminating the apprenticeship system imposed by the half-hearted emancipation act of 1833. The methods of agitation and information of the public mind then employed were most sagaciously and industriously used for the overthrow of slavery in the United States by casting the moral weight of Great Britain into the scale against the power which was on the side of the oppressor. They were equally available on behalf of the natives of India as against the East India Company; or against the corn laws and in support of the Chartists; against male monopoly of the higher education; against the Contagious Diseases Acts; against cruelty to animals. No humane interest was foreign to her as Miss Pease or Mrs. Nichol, and she brought to each a rare degree of business and executive ability. Her old age was beautiful in the extreme, and, even when sightless, she was all alive to the politics and the philanthropy of the hour, as well as to her numerous friendships on both sides of the Atlantic.

A perusal of this biography suggests a consideration of how much the world has lost in the practical abandonment by Quakerism—by British Quakerism, at least—of its most moving peculiarities (which, however, Mrs. Nichol never lost). Apart from church government and forms of worship, and as yet a lingering greater simplicity of social life, there is little now to distinguish Friends from members of other religious bodies. The scruples have mostly vanished. We have seen the list of a Friend stock-broking firm, one of whose members preaches in meeting, in which shares in taverns, breweries, and theatres are advertised. We are not aware of any collective protest having been made by the Society against the Transvaal war even as war. On the contrary, more strenuous individual testimony against it has been borne by individual members of other bodies than by individual Friends. Friends now without objection don the military garb of Deputy-Lieutenants of counties. Entering the civil service and professions, they have lost their old independence of thought and action, and compound for (in the main) abandoning their old humanitarian rôle at home and abroad by principally devoting themselves to foreign missions, in which sphere they run no chance of endangering personal interests. It was not so when Quakerism gave birth to spirits like Elizabeth Pease Nichol.

The Family of William Penn. By Howard M. Jenkins. Philadelphia: The Author. 1899.

In this considerable work Mr. Jenkins has collected all that he could gather on the genealogy of the Penn family. He has not undertaken to make it a history of the Penns, for that would have led him far into the rise and position of the Quakers in England and the founding and early records of Pennsylvania. Confining himself as he does to the immediate family, he has been obliged to omit much of a more general interest bearing upon the intentions of the colonizers and their relations to state policy. As it is, the record was not a simple one to compile, for authorities have been contradictory, and the loss or absence of important links in the chain of evidence has given occasion to conjecture. The name and tradition point to a Welsh origin for the family, but the first authentic records begin with the fourth generation from William Penn, and locate his ancestor in the County of Gloucester. It was Admiral Penn who gave the family prominence, and he would not be so well known but for the many references, complimentary and otherwise, given to him and his doings by Pepys. The son of the Admiral was William Penn, whose religious experiences and the hardships and reputation gained through them, are too familiar to need summarizing. Mr. Jenkins refutes the story that Penn died insane, but shows him embarrassed in means, in spite of his American principality. His widow was at times hard pushed to obtain so small a sum as ten pounds.

Among the original documents printed by Mr. Jenkins are some interesting letters of Hannah, the wife of William Penn. They throw light upon the household of the founder, and incidentally point to her struggle to obtain the means to meet the current expenses of her family. Some slaves were included in the estate, and she wrote: "The young Blacks must be dispos'd of to prevent their increasing Charge. I have offer'd my Daughter Aubrey one, but she does not care for any. I would, however, have ye likelyest Boy reserv'd, and bred to reading & sobriety as intending him for my self, or one of my children." The worthless son, William, sought to overthrow his father's will, and laid claim to the proprietorship of Pennsylvania, but was defeated in the attempt; and died soon after. His half-brother, Thomas, became principal proprietor, and held the trust for nearly thirty years, although residing in America only nine years. It was his nephew John who was Governor of Pennsylvania when the Revolution caused the collapse of all the Penn interests in the colony, with a loss amounting to nearly $7,500,000, the larger part of which was represented by unsold lands. Pennsylvania voted him a large sum after the peace, and a royal pension was given to him for his loyalty. The early marriage of John is lightly touched upon, but not explained, and the family history of the brothers is given.

Mr. Jenkins has drawn largely from the manuscripts of the Pennsylvania Historical Society, and has made an interesting compilation, of which the general accuracy is very high. The book has many portraits.

A Political History of Europe since 1814. By Charles Seignobos. Translation edited by S. M. Macvane. Henry Holt & Co. 1899.

Whenever translation renders an important work accessible to a large audience which would otherwise be deprived of its use, the translator's services should be swiftly recognized and defined. Prof. Macvane says, with studied moderation: "'The Histoire Politique de l'Europe Contemporaine,' by Prof. Seignobos, seems to me to merit larger use among people of English speech than it is likely to receive in the original French"; and, in fact, the book in question is one of very high importance to all who read history, and especially to such as are not engaged in its professional study. If a reader is prevented by circumstances from making his own investigations, he is a good deal at the mercy of his author, and, accordingly, the latter's fairness or unfairness becomes of the first consequence. Most of all is this true where recent history is concerned.

Now Prof. Seignobos, apart from his splendid store of knowledge, both mediæval and modern, his skill in putting a statement clearly, and his general cleverness, yields to no one in sincerity of tone. Prof. Macvane counts among his author's various good qualities a "thorough freedom from national or other prejudice." The praise is just, and carries a special meaning when elicited by a work upon the present subject. For instance, if one were comparing Seignobos with Fyffe in the matter of impartiality, the Frenchman would be called quite the more impersonal of the two. Prof. Macvane found the English chapters of the book less satisfactory than the others, but none of their shortcomings can be ascribed to a polemical spirit. Seignobos is learned, accomplished, clear, and the appearance in our language of his 'Histoire Contemporaine' must be a source of satisfaction to others besides college teachers and their classes.

The translation, with its index, contains more than 880 pages (or about four-fifths of the number in Fyffe), and is accordingly so long that we are unable to analyze the body of contents; but, with the aid of the author's preface, we shall try to explain the purpose which the work contemplates. Seignobos begins with a query. Having admitted his rashness in publishing a one-volume history of contemporary Europe, he proceeds: "The question is, not whether this history be worth reading, but whether it can be written." An overwhelming sup-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ply of material blocks the way, for since vigorous historical method demands the direct study of the sources, the conscientious inquirer is brought to a halt. "The life of one man would not be long enough, I do not say to study or to criticise, but to read the official documents of even a single country of Europe." A modern author must yield to practical necessities, and make his attempt under limitations which are none the less strict because inevitable and clearly defined.

Thus beset, Seignobos falls back on "monographs, special histories, and annual publications, all made at first hand." These furnish a solid framework of fact, and, where doubt arises over their accuracy, they can be easily controlled by comparison and other simple tests. A second difficulty, that arising from the citation of authorities, is partially met by frequent reference to selected bibliographies. The chapters are short, and at the end of each a list of sources and works is given. By avoiding the establishment of disputed facts and the discovery of new ones, the text is still further compressed. Lastly, the author has renounced "all attempts at full narrative, all descriptions, character-sketches, and anecdotes; such things being nearly always matters of dispute."

We dwell at length upon the method which Seignobos employs because his book is extraordinarily useful and its scope should be fully outlined. Erudition, controversy, and picturesqueness he eschews in order to accomplish one end. "My aim has been to enable my readers to comprehend the essential phenomena of the political life of Europe in the nineteenth century, by explaining the organization of the nations, governments, and parties, the political questions which have arisen in the course of the century, and the solutions they have received. I have tried to write an *explanatory* history." Social, intellectual, and artistic phenomena are strictly excluded, and if any non-political facts are used, it is simply in a context which connects them with politics.

Seignobos's 'Contemporary Europe' is, then, a masterly explanation of political movements. It begins at the Congress of Vienna, and reaches a very recent date in the case of each country or of each episode considered. The author does not commit himself, hands bound, to any special form of treatment, whether comparative, chronological, or geographical. Throughout the greater part of the work he follows a geographical line of division, beginning with England, "which furnished the model of political organization for all Europe," and ending with "the group of eastern states, Ottoman and Russian, which have longest retained the political forms of the eighteenth century." When he wishes to consider the material conditions of political life, the state of the Roman Church, and the international parties of revolution, he uses a comparative method. And when he passes the external relations of states under review (*e. g.*, the System of Metternich, Rivalry between Russia and England, the Nationalist Wars, and the Armed Peace) he observes the order of time. Each passage is carefully wrought, and the combination of passages forms a luminous whole.

Prof. Macvane is responsible for the quality of the translation, but it will be noticed that on the title-page he speaks of himself as an editor. "Most of the actual labor of translation has been done by another." The English version is correct and smooth, and a good index has been added. Prof. Macvane, however, has not limited himself to contributing the preface. He has "freely revised and partly rewritten the chapters on England" because they seemed not quite to equal the remainder of the volume in excellence. We need only say of the changes that they have not reached the point of structural alteration, and are an improvement upon the original.

We have described the character of this treatise so far as possible in its own words and from its own standpoint. Its value is so great because it represents admirable knowledge and discernment, together with skill in the rapid explanation of large questions. For the early stages of university work it is too advanced, but for maturer undergraduates as well as for adults it must prove an invaluable guide.

Under Three Flags in Cuba. By George Clarke Musgrave. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1899.

This narrative purports to be "a personal account of the Cuban Insurrection and Spanish-American War." According to his story, the author joined Ruis Rivera's western army, as a newspaper correspondent, just after Maceo's death; made his way into the Spanish lines; went familiarly about Havana, attended executions at Cabañas, chatted with Weyler and had some thought of kidnapping him; worked eastward again among the insurgents, meeting Gomez, Garcia, and the insurgent Government in Camagüey; saw a number of fights; returned to Havana, was imprisoned as a spy, transported to Spain, and released as a British subject in time to witness the Santiago campaign.

An author with such opportunities should have written a memorable book. Perhaps the seizure of his original manuscript, "together with three hundred photographs of Weyler's régime in Cuba and some historical letters that had passed between the Captain-General and Premier Cánovas," accounts for his failure to do so. Barring his picture of the horrors of a Spanish transport and the common ill-treatment of Spanish conscripts, there is nothing new in the whole volume. Moreover, the writer's chronology is so incoherent that one follows his wanderings with difficulty; and his personal story is lost in a jungle of hearsay and extraneous matter. Even in what he describes as an eye-witness, the "journalistic" habit distorts his vision. The "swells of the organ" and "the voices of the choir" "wafted across the bay" from the Cathedral, steal upon the ears of the dying patriots at Cabañas. From Marianao (which he calls "Mariano") just beyond the River Almendares (which he calls "Almanares"), he notes the moon's "pure radiance lighting up the distant spires and domes of Havana," resting on "massive guns" where "the great Santa Clara and Vedado batteries loomed grimly in the distance," "making them gleam like polished silver," etc., etc. This is a sublimation of hearing and eye-sight—like listening to the choir of Trinity from Columbia Heights, and watching the ferry-slips at Cortlandt Street from Spuyten Duyvil! The book is characterized throughout by such loose and bombastic writing, by misstated facts of common knowledge, and misspelled names in common use. The author claims a part in the rescue of Evangelina Cisneros, and betrays in an unconscious note (p. 104) how far the irresponsible vagaries of "yellow journalism" may go for mischief: "Mr. Decker, during the winter, formulated a plan to rescue Capt. Dreyfus, which Mr. Hearst wished to effect without causing international complications, . . . but the *Maine* disaster and the war diverted this unprecedented journalistic enterprise."

Sextus Empiricus and Greek Scepticism. By Mary Mills Patrick. Cambridge, Eng.: Deighton, Bell & Co. 1899.

The movement called Scepticism—for it cannot be called a philosophy—has never laid strong hold of the imaginations of men. There is in the human being an ingrained love of dogmatizing; and a method which is entirely negative and offers nothing in place of the belief that it destroys, has little chance of taking root. The very name of the founder of the sceptic school, Pyrrho, is a secret of scholarship; for the agnostics of Greece, like their modern imitators, were not represented by any figure so commanding as to compel the attention of the ignorant. Pyrrhonism and Pyrrho are mere shadows. What layman off-hand could come within a century of the date of Sextus Empiricus, perhaps the greatest of them all? Yet, with these two men, Scepticism was much more than the mental laziness that is often the only basis of agnosticism.

When we call a man a sceptic, we imply merely that he does not hold certain conventional beliefs. The followers of Pyrrho so directed their reasoning powers to suspend their judgment that they saw both sides of every question with perfect impartiality. Absence of dogmatism was their aim; but what actually resulted was a state of mental equilibrium that cannot be distinguished from the *æquus animus* of the Stoic dogmatist. Apathy follows this sort of agnosticism as if by chance, as a shadow follows the body; and this is the most positive side of a philosophy that was unique in that it drew no moral conclusions, had no criterion, and could never state the grounds of its negations. To do so would be to dogmatize.

We fear that Mrs. Patrick's volume will never reach those whose ignorance of Sextus Empiricus it is intended to dispel. Her thesis is admirable for its purpose as a doctor's dissertation (accepted at Berne in 1897), and, as a supplement to Zeller, will be read with interest by students. Sextus Empiricus was a sceptical doctor who lived (probably) at the close of the second century A. D. He spent his life in attacking Stoic dogmatism and, in general, all the sciences that men have labored to construct. We have the "Hypotyposes," the public lectures in which he tried to demolish dogmatism, and not the least valuable part of the present work is the translation of these by the authoress. There is an interesting chapter on the relation of Pyrrhonism and the Scepticism of the Academy.

If we had thought that the English of the President of a college must be above suspicion, the writer's style would be a disillusion. On p. 29 we encounter this curiously compounded sentence: "He threw the sponge at the picture that he had used to wipe the colors from the painting with." The fol-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowing positively defy analysis: "He states that a philosopher himself is a part of the discord, and to be judged, rather than being capable of judging" (p. 45); "Saisset is correct in saying . . . but it is not correct when we consider" (p. 57). A thesis which is published in book form invites criticism and should at least be free from bad grammar. On p. 82 the phrase Antigonus of Carystius is presumably a slip.

A World in a Garden. By R. Neish. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 1899.

It is the hard-won Scotch garden which, in its owner's esteem, surpasses all others, and the enthusiasm with which this author writes of his brief northern blooms would seem exaggerated to the South, where flowers are matter of course the whole year through, and no long winter sleep adds intensity to the common joy in spring's awakening. But the "world" held by this garden is more than a collection of vegetable life. Poetry, religion, and philosophy are discussed with the plants, which our author finds appreciative, perhaps instructive, interlocutors; even doting upon the absence of more disputatious human neighbors. Why, then, should he seek the audience he professes to scorn, or at least disregard? The assumption that his personality is of general interest is, of course, necessary to the man who sits down to write a personal book; but when we are led into a garden only to talk about its owner, we feel a little tricked, and inclined to doubt the genuineness of his enthusiasm as a gardener, and to wonder if in other circumstances he might not have unfolded himself just the same on the text of carpets and furniture. "I have always loved Chippendale chairs," tells as much of a man's character as, "I have always loved lilies"; and equally invites the reply, "Lucky dog, to have some to love."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Alden, R. MacD. The Rise of Formal Satire in England. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Alexander, P. Y. Darwin and Darwinism Pure and Mixed. London: John Bale, Sons & Danielsson. 7s. 6d.
Arey, A. L. Elementary Chemistry. Macmillan. 90c.
Atkinson, P. Power Transmitted by Electricity. London: Crosby, Lockwood & Son; New York: D. Van Nostrand Co. $2.
Austen, Jane. Pride and Prejudice, Persuasion, Emma, Mansfield Park, Sense and Sensibility, Northanger Abbey. [Temple ed.] London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 8 vols. $8.
Baird, Prof. H. M. Theo. Beza, the Counsellor of the French Reformation. Putnams. $1.50.
Balfour, Lady Betty. The History of Lord Lytton's Indian Administration. Longmans, Green & Co.
Barnes, Rev. W. E. The Books of Chronicles. Macmillan. $1.
Bascom, J. Growth of Nationality in the United States: A Social Study. Putnams. $1.25.
Benson, A. C. The Life of Edward White, Sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. Macmillan. 2 vols. $8.
Bernard, Rev. J. H. The Pastoral Epistles. Macmillan. 90c.
Bishop, Isabella B. The Yangtze Valley and Beyond. Putnams. 2 vols. $6.
Black, N. F. First Reader. Macmillan.
Bourinot, Sir J. G. Builders of Novia Scotia. A Historical Review. Toronto: The Copp-Clark Co.
Bowman, Isa. The Story of Lewis Carroll. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.
Brown, Prof. W. J. The New Democracy. A Political Study. Macmillan. $2.
Bury, Bishop R. de. Philobiblon. New York: Meyer Bros. & Co. $2.50.
Charles, Rev. R. H. A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity. London: Adam & Charles Black; New York: Macmillan. $5.
Chiniquy, Rev. C. Forty Years in the Church of Christ. Fleming H. Revell Co. $2.50.
Cowell, B. The Hungarian Exiles. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.; Milwaukee: Young Churchman Co. $1.
Crookes, Sir W. The Wheat Problem. London: John Murray; New York: Putnams. $1.25.
Cruttwell, Maud. Luca Signorelli. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.75.
Dearmer, Mabel. The Book of Penny Toys. Macmillan. $2.
Densmore, Dr. E. Consumption and Chronic Diseases. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: The Stillman Pub. Co.
Dresser, H. W. Voices of Freedom and Studies in the Philosophy of Individuality. Putnams. $1.25.
Earle, J. Microcosmographie. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Macmillan. 50c.
Emerson, E., jr. Pepys's Ghost. Boston: Richard G. Badger & Co. $1.25.
Fernald, J. C. True Motherhood. Funk & Wagnalls Co. 60c.
Fortescue, J. W. A History of the British Army. Macmillan. 2 vols. $4.
Headlam, J. W. Bismarck and the New German Empire. Putnams. $1.50.
Hewlett, M. Earthwork out of Tuscany. New ed. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: Putnams. $2.50.
Hiatt, C. Henry Irving. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $3.
Hunt, Violet B. Prisoners of the Tower of London. London: J. M. Dent & Co.; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $2.50.
Hutton, C. A. Greek Terracotta Statuettes. Macmillan. $2.50.
Janes, Emily. The English Woman's Year-Book and Directory. London: Adam & Charles Black; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Jephson, H. The Real French Revolution. Macmillan. $1.75.
King, Prof. F. H. Irrigation and Drainage. Macmillan. $1.50.
Lanciani, Prof. R. The Destruction of Ancient Rome. Macmillan. $2.
Letchworth, W. P. Care and Treatment of Epileptics. Putnams. $4.
Letters of Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol College. Arranged and Edited by Evelyn Abbott and Lewis Campbell. London: John Murray; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. $5.
Lilly, W. S. First Principles in Politics. London: John Murray; New York: Putnams. $2.50.
Macmillan, H. Gleanings in Holy Fields. Macmillan. $1.50.
Main, E. Cities and Sights of Spain. London: George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $2.
Mason, Rev. A. J. The Five Theological Orations of Gregory of Nazianzus. London: C. J. Clay & Sons; New York: Macmillan. $1.50.
Mather, F. J. Chaucer's Prologue, The Knight's Tale and the Nun's Priest's Tale from the Canterbury Tales. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 40c.
Metcalfe, J. S. Mythology for Moderns. Life Pub. Co. $1.
Meyer, R. M. Die Deutsche Litteratur des Neunzehnten Jahrhunderts. Berlin: Georg Bondi; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Montefiore, C. G. The Bible for Home Reading. Macmillan. Parts 1 and 2. $2.50.
Murray, D. A. Plane Trigonometry for Colleges and Secondary Schools. Longmans, Green & Co.
Nitobé, Inazo. Bushido the Soul of Japan. Philadelphia: The Leeds & Biddle Co. $1.
Norway, A. H. Highways and Byways in Yorkshire. Macmillan. $2.
Palmer, Florence U. One Year of Sunday-School Lessons for Young Children. Macmillan. $1.
Pattee, Prof. F. L. The Foundations of English Literature. Silver, Burdett & Co. $1.50.
Peard, Frances M., Donna Teresa. Macmillan. $1.50.
Royce, Prof. J. The World and the Individual. Macmillan. $3.
Shakespeare, W. Tempest. Cassells. 10c.
Shorey, Prof. P. Pope's The Iliad of Homer. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 35c.
Shuckburgh, E. S. The Letters of Cicero. London; George Bell & Sons; New York: Macmillan. 2 vols. $3.
Sienkiewicz, H. The Knights of the Cross, or Krzyzacy. R. F. Fenno & Co. 2 vols. $2.
Silberrad, U. L. The Enchanter. Macmillan. $1.50.
Some Things That Trouble Young Manhood. New York: Styles & Cash.
The Living Age. Vol. 5. Boston: The Living Age Co.
The Works of Shakespeare. [Eversley ed.] Vol. X. Macmillan. $1.50.
Welton, Prof. J. The Logical Bases of Education. Macmillan. $1.

"A style which can fairly be described as fascinating. . . . One of the most important books on music that have ever been published."—W. J. HENDERSON, *Musical Critic of the N. Y. Times.*

LAVIGNAC'S MUSIC AND MUSICIANS.

2D EDITION. 504 pp. 8vo, $3.00.

Henry Holt & Co., New York

BUILDERS OF GREATER BRITAIN.
NEW VOLUME.

Rajah Brooke.

The Englishman as Ruler of an Eastern State. By Sir SPENSER ST. JOHN, G.C.M.G., Author of "Hayti; or, the Black Republic," etc., etc. With Portrait and 2 Maps. Crown 8vo, $1.50.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.,
91-93 Fifth Ave., New York.

TIFFANY STUDIOS

Illustrated Historical Booklets sent upon request—(1) *Favrile Glass*, (2) *Lamps and Fixtures*, (3) *Glass Mosaic*, (4) *Memorial Windows*, (5) *Memorial Tablets*, (6) *Monuments.*
333-341 FOURTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

AUTOGRAPH LETTERS of famous persons **Bought and Sold**
WALTER R. BENJAMIN, 1125 Broadway, New York.
SEND FOR PRICE LISTS.

By MINOT J. SAVAGE, D. D.

Life Beyond Death

Being a review of the World's Beliefs on the Subject, a consideration of Present Conditions of Thought and Feeling, leading to the Question as to Whether it can be Demonstrated as a Fact.

Third Impression. 8vo, $1.50.

"The book is a sane, wholesome, sunny view of human nature and religious thought, and whether a man is very religious or not he will enjoy reading it, if he is a thinking man. It is a book which will help a great many people, and it ought to have a wide sale."—Washington Times.

"This volume is dedicated to the son who was suddenly called last spring from a life of promise and usefulness into the great beyond; and Dr. Savage pours out his soul in the mingled language of sorrow and faith, which puts into his hope the emotional temper of Channing and the intellectual spirit of Parker. It shows the strong inspiration that governs the work, and which balances all the moral, religious, and scientific forces in the world between the claims of scientific method and the ideal of religion. The book unquestionably marks a tremendous reaction against the materialism of the past."—Christian Register.

G. P. Putnam's Sons,
27 AND 29 WEST 23D ST., - - NEW YORK

A Handbook of CUBA, PORTO RICO, HAWAII, and the PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

OUR ISLAND EMPIRE

By CHARLES MORRIS. With Maps. 12mo, cloth, $1.50.

For sale by all booksellers.

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY, Publishers, Phila.

THE FUTURE OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO.

By BOOKER T. WASHINGTON.

Price, $1.50.

"In respect of distinction alike of style, insight, outlook, spirit, and manner, this discussion of 'The Future of the American Negro,' by Booker T. Washington, is as noteworthy as any book which has appeared during the year."—*Chicago Evening Post.*

SMALL, MAYNARD & COMPANY,
Boston.

NOW READY.

The Natural History of Selborne.

By GILBERT WHITE.

Edited by GRANT ALLEN. With upwards of 200 Illustrations by EDMUND H. NEW. Containing Photogravure Portraits of Thomas Pennant and Daines Barrington, and some hitherto unpublished Notes by SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE. Uniform with "Walton's Angler."
Fcap 4to. 568 pages, bound in buckram. $7.50.

JOHN LANE, 251 5th Ave., N.Y. City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED